ಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಬೇಗ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ತರಿಸುವ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಮತ್ತು ಅದು ಬಂದಕೂಡಲೇ, ನಾನು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಮುಂದೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಎಂಥಹ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಹಾಗೆ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಸಿ. ನಾನಯ್ಯ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರ ಅಧಿಕಾರದ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ನೀರು ಸರಬರಾಜು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಧನ್ಯವಾದಗಳನ್ನರ್ಪಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್.—ನೀರಿನ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಒಂದು ಇನ್‌ಹೆರೆಂಟ್ ಪ್ರಾಬ್ಲಮ್ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಾವು ನೂರು ಭಾವಿಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಭಾವಿಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟ. ಒಬ್ಬ ಡಾಕ್ಟರಿಗೆ ನೂರು ಜನ ರೋಗಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅವನು ಎಲ್ಲರನ್ನು ಬದುಕಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಬರೆದುಕೊಡುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟ. ತೊಂದರೆಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಸರಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಆಶ್ರಯ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಇಲ್ಲ, ಅಥವಾ ದುಡ್ಡು ಪೋಲು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Notice of Adjournment Motion

re: Findings of the Grover Commission

SRI S. R. BOMMAI (Hubli).—Sir, I have given notice under Rule 50.

MR. SPEAKER.—I will hear your preliminary speech.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—The notice I have given is :

> "It is submitted that the business of the Assembly do stand adjourned for the purpose of discusing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the findings of the Grover Commission, finding Mr. D. Devaraj Urs guilty of corruption nepotism, abuse of authority of power etc."

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಇದು ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯ ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಸಾಕು.

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—Sir, I would request you to allow us also to discuss if you allow them to discuss. If you want to hear only what he has to say in a nutshell, then it would be all right.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—I agree with Mr. Bhaskar Naidu. The matter being of great importance, as many members as possible may be allowed to participate, including some of the signatories.

MR. SPEAKER.—One or two will be sufficient.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—This is a matter of great importance. Therefore the Chair should exercise discretion and permit not only the signatories but also the hon'ble members on the other side. It depends upon the importance of the matter.

MR. SPEAKER.—About 10 members have signed the notice, and I suggest that about 2 to 3 may speak.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—If the Chair is convinced and adjournment motion is allowed, then there will be no need for others to make a speech.

MR. SPEAKER.—It depends upon the merits.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—In such a matter of great importance, it should not be restricted.

MR. SPEAKER.—That is not the convention. The entire House need not discuss, at this stage.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI—I don't say every member should be permitted We don't want unnecessarily to spend the valuable time of the House.

† SRI M.C. NANAIAH—While allowing the Leader of the Opposition to speak regarding the admissibility of the motion, if the members who have given notice of such motion were to enter into the merits of the case, then we have got every right to object. The question would be whether the motion is legally admissible. That is the point to be discussed No person who has given notice shall have the right to speak about the merits of the case. The question is whether the findings of the Grover Commission are of such urgent public importance. Without referring to the merits of the case, they may speak. When a particular specific issue has been raised and one member speaks about the admissibility of it, giving permission to all the signatories tantamounts to going outside the limits. If the Leader of the Opposition is allowed to speak about the admissibility, we have to be allowed to speak about the inadmissibility. If all the members who have given notice are given opportunity to speak, similar number of members on this side also should be given an opportunity. That is all I wish to say.

2-00 P. M.

SRI K BHASKER NAIDU.—Rightly Mr. Nanaiah has pointed out whether it should be admitted or not to be admitted is the only thing that we have to discuss. The whole subject is brought in a muffled way and put it in the House. Actually, we are debating the whole thing. I would request the Chair to prevent such things; Otherwise. we have also to interfere and stop what the hon'ble member has to say

MR. SPEAKER.—This is only a preliminary say. Let him say, what he wants to say.

SRI K. BHASKER NAIDU—Preliminary say is only about admissibility; Preliminaries cannot be brought in a muffled way.

MR. SPEAKER.—Before admitting it, I have to hear. Let him say what he wants to say.

SRI K.BHASKER NAIDU.—There is no question of discussing the matter. The admissibility as per the law has to be seen. In a muffled way, the whole subject is brought and put it in fhe House. It is better to restrict the time also, to discuss about the law point involved.

SRI M. C. NANAIAH.—I am raising one point of order. In this issue, what is it we are debating to-day?

MR SPEAKER.—Who said that there is a debate...

SRI M. C. NANAIAH—The Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition has said about the findings of the Grover Commission. The report of the Grover Commission has been tabled on the Floor of the Parliament yesterday. That report has already been submitted to the Government of India about two months back. The Government tabled it only yesterday and what we have heard is it is being transmitted. Now, as far as that report is concerned, that is a property of the Parliament today, and the Parliament has not finally disposed off the matter. What we have heard and what information I have got, the same information the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition has also has. They say it is being transmitted. So, it is the property of House and nothing has been done. The report has not been received. We don't have the facts at all; We don't have the report. What is ther to discuss? Whether such an issue can be raised is my point of order. Let the report come. Then, let them raise it and not otherwise.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.- ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಏನು ಸೂಚನೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದರ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ.........

SRI V V. PATTAR—I rise to a point of order...

SRI B. B. SAYANAK.—Hon'ble Member Sri Nanaiah has raised a point of order. We want to know what is the ruling given by the Chair on that point of order.

SRI M. C. NANAIAH.—I want a ruling. Now the point of order is this: what we have heard including the Hon"ble Leader of Opposition is only through the Press and radio. Now, we are trying to discuss the findings of the Grover Commission. Where is that report? Do we have facts before us? Now, as far as that report is concerned, that is the property of the House and it is being transmitted to the State Government. As long as we don't have the report at all and as long as we don't have the facts at all. Can we proceed on the basis of what the Press has said? Would it be a fair convention? What I submit is that there is no course of action to raise an issue of this type because

there is no report at present with us. In the light of this, I seek a ruling from the Chair. The very submission of the Notice to the Speaker itself cannot be entertained because under the Rules, such a thing cannot be taken up also, I want a ruling from the Chair.

SRI V. V. PATTAR.—The Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition has read out the Motion...

SRI S. M. SHEERNALY CHANDRASHEKAR.—What is the ruling on the point of order raised by the hon'ble Member Sri Nanaiah?

MR. SPEAKER.—I am going to give my ruling afterwards. Let me hear first, and then, I will give my ruling.

(4–5 hon'ble Members stood up to speak)

SRI B. B. SAYANAK.—I rise on a point of order. How many members can speak at a time?

MR. SPEAKER.—Please have some patience. I want to know what he wants to say.

SRI S. M. SHEERNALY CHANDRASHEKAR.—I want to know whether the Hon'ble Speaker has permitted him to speak. If he has permitted then, he has got all the right o speak but now, the Hon'ble Speaker has not yet permitted.

MR. SPEAKER.—Before admitting the Motion, I have to give an opportunity to hon'ble Membe s. I have to hear them and taen give either my consent or refuse my consent to the motion depending upon the circumstances. It is left to the Chair to a decision.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಶೀರ್ನಾಳಿ ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ್.—ತಾವು ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲೇ ಅವರ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದು ಮೊದಲಿನಿಂದಲೂ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇದು ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯ ರಿವಾಜ್ ಆಗಿಬಿಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ, ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ. Until the Chair gives permission, these matter should not be raised.

MR. SPEAKER.—About the notice given by Sri Bommai and others, I have to give my decision regarding its admissibility or not only after hearing them. Let the hon'ble Members have some patience. Let me hear Sri Bommai.

SRI S. M. SHEERNALY CHANDRASHEKAR.—In the beginning itself, he has raised a point of order, stating that the report is not on the Floor of this House. The Chair has to give a ruling on that point of order,

MR. SPEAKER—I have not heard him. I want to hear him.

SRI S. M. SHEERNALLY CHANDRASHEKAR.—The Motion is placed on the Floor of the House without any document to support it. The Chair can disallow it at the initial stage itsef. That is our objection

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—Is he in possession of the report?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್ ಎಂ. ಶೀರ್ನಾಳಿ ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಕಳೆದ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದಿಂದಲೂ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ತಾವು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲೇ ಆ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ರೀತಿಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಯೂ ಆಗಿಬಿಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಅನಂತರ ಅದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅನಂತರ ತಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ಅಲೋ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅದೇರೀತಿ ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸವೂ ಆಗುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಡಾಕ್ಯುಮೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಯಾವುದೂ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಗೊತ್ತೋ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ನಮಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವುದು. ರೇಡಿಯೋ ಮತ್ತು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳ ಮೂಲಕ ಅವರು ವಿಷಯ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವಂತೆ ನಾವೂ ಸಹ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಈ ಹಂತದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದೆಯೋ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹಾರ್ನಳ್ಳಿ ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಅರಿಕೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೇ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇಡವೇ ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಕಡೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇಡವೋ ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆಯೇ ಸುಧೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ನಾಲ್ಕಾರು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಆ ರೆಂಟು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ, ಅದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾಲವೆಲ್ಲಾ ವ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗಬಹುದು, ಆದಕಾರಣ ಯಾರು ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದಾರೋ, ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಅಥವಾ ಇಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅನಂತರ ಆ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಕಡೆಯ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಅಥವಾ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ ನಂತರ ತಾವು ಪುನಃ ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡದೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಈ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ರೈಜ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭವೇ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಹಂತದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ತಮ್ಮಿಂದ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶೀರ್ನಾಳಿ ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ್ ಅವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತೀವ್ರ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಟಿಕ್ಸ್ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗೊಂದಲ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಆಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಡಿಸಾಲ್ವ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಾ. ಪ್ರಾಪಗಂಡಾ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಈ ತರಹ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು, ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಇಡೀ ಒಂದು ಸದನದ ಒಂದು ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮತ್ತು ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ಸ್ ಮೇಲೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಟಿಕ್ಸ್ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ನಮ್ಮ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ. ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕನ್ವಿನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಲು ಪ್ರಿಲಿಮಿನರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಅವರು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಅಲೋ ಮಾಡದೆ ಡಿಸ್‌ಅಲೋ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆ. ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಚ್ಯುತಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಪ್ರೆಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾಪಗ್ಯಾಂಡಾ ಬರುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆನ್ನುವ ಮಾತು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ್ ಹೇಳಿದಂತ ಮಾತನ್ನು ರೆಕಾರ್ಡಿನಿಂದ ತೆಗೆಯಬೇಕು.

MR. SPEAKER.—I will examine that point.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಎನ್. ರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮಳ್ಳೂರ್ ಅನಂದರಾವ್ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ ಅವರು ಮೋಷನ್ ತರುವ ಮುಂಚೆ ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಇಂಪಾರ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಇಷ್ಯೂ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು ಆದರೆ ನಾನು ಅದು ಇಂಪಾರ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಇಷ್ಯೂ ಅಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗತಾನೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಿತ್ರರಾದ ನಾನಯ್ಯನವರು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ

ಹೇಳಿದಂತಹ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟ್ಸ್ ಅಂಡ್ ಫಿಗರ್ಸ್ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕಾನೂನು ರೀತಿ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ತಾವು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಕ್ಷಣ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಇದು ಗ್ರೋವರ್ ಆಯೋಗಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯ. ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯ ಎಂದು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನ ಮುಂದೆ ಇದೆ ಎಂದೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೇ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇಡವೇ ಎನ್ನುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಒಂದು ನೋಟೀಸನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. I have to give an opportunity to the Leader of the Opposition for a preliminary say in the matter. Please have some patience. Therefore, after hearing them ನಾನು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—Sir, we will abide by your decision. But I would like to know whether the House is in possession of all the materials relating to the findings of the Grover Commission's Report. Has it been submitted to the Hon'ble Speaker by our Leader of the Opposition.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನು ಏನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಬೇಡ ಎಂದರೆ ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಅಡ್ಜರ್ನ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಹೊರಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—We will bow to your ruling. But I would like to know have we got that report from the Central Government ?

† ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಮೂಲ್ಯ ಸಮಯ ವೇಸ್ಟ್ ಆಗಬಾರದು. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಸುಮಾರು ೧೦ ನಿಮಿಷಗಳಿಂದ ೮ ೧೦ ಮಂದಿ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತು ಹೇಗೆ ಸಮಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಯ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂಬುದು ನಿಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದಾಗ ಇದನ್ನು ಅಡ್ಮಿಟ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಕನ್ವಿನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ಈ ಮನೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯ. ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದು. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದು. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಪ್ರಜೆಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೆರಿಟ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಉಚಿತವೇ ? ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ಊರಿಗೆ ಬೆಂಕಿ ಬಿದ್ದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅದರ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ತರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡೋಣವೆಂದರೆ ಹೇಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಇದು ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಗ್ರೋವರ್ ಆಯೋಗದ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಇದು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಪರ್ಮಿಷನ್ ಕೇಳಬಾರದು ಎನ್ನುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಔಚಿತ್ಯ ಇದೆಯೆ ? ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ, ಮಹತ್ವವಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಗ್ರೋವರ್ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಲೋಕ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನೇ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎನ್. ಕೆಂಗೇಗೌಡ.—ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಡಿ.

SRI V. V. PATTAR.—I raise a point of order. Sir, the Leader of the Opposition has no right to move this adjournment motion. That is my point of order.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳು ವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಯೆ ?

SRI V. V. PATTAR.—Sir, the Leader of the Opposition has no right to move this adjournment motion. That is my objection.

SRI B. V. RAMACHANDRA REDDY.—Sir, because there is no emergency all of us have got right to speak.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಯಾರೇ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಮತ್ತು ಅದರಿಂದ ಗೌರವ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಎದ್ದುನಿಂತು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾದುದಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ರಾಮ್‌ದೇವ್.—ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿಯಮ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿಯಮ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಕೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾವು ಅನೇಕ ಸಾರಿ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅವರ ಅಡ್ಮಿಷನ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಿಲಿಮನರಿಯಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈಗ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಬೇಡ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ರಾಮ್‌ದೇವ್.—ಈ ನಿಯಮ ೫೦ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಏನು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದು ಬಹಳ ಜರೂರಾದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವ ವಿಚಾರ ತಮಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟದ್ದು. ಈಗ ಅದರ ಅಡ್ಮಿಷನ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಿಲಿಮನರಿ ಡಿಸ್‌ಕಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲದವರೆಗೂ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಾಣಯ್ಯನವರು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪ ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿ ಸಂತೋಷವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ದುಃಖವೂ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಕಡೆಯ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಪಟಪಟನೆ ಎದ್ದು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ತರಹ ಕನ್‌ಫ್ಯೂಸನ್ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದ ರೀತಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಿಗೆ ಮೋಷನ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಹಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಲಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ದುಃಖ ಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ನಾಳೆ ನಾನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಹಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಾಣಯ್ಯನವರು ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು. They have raised a point of order as to whether there is a subject matter without a report being presented in this House. Whether such a matter could be discussed. On that point only I would like to submit some points to the Hon. Speaker. On that point only I am submitting. Sir, the findings are there and they have been published in the Press and they are known. Every matter to be discussed under a motion under Rule 50 need not be based on a document; it need not even be published in the Press. The question is, whether it is a specific matter, whether it is an urgent matter and whether it is of recent occurence. This is the only thing we have to take into consideration. It is a fact that Justice

Grover has given a finding and nobody can deny it. It is a fact, it is a matter and that matter is going to be discussed. The Chief Minister has been held guilty on eight counts, but I am not going into the details. It is a specific and urgent matter of recent occurrence and as such I am entitled to make preliminary submission. So far as the point of order raised by the hon. Member Sri Nanaiah is concerned, the speaker can give a ruling. After that I will make my preliminary submission.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಯಾವಾಗ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರೆ, ವಿಷಯ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಮೇಲೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. I have got an open mind. ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅಲೋಃ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಅವರು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೂ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡದೇ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಲಿ?

SRI S. M. SHEERANALI CHANDRASEKHAR.—Sir, rule 54 is clear and according to that you have to give consent. My fear is that the hon. Members of the Opposition go on discussing the subject matter.

MR. SPEAKER.—Who has said that it is going to be discussed? If he is presuming things, how am I responsible?

SRI S. M. SHEERANALI CHANDRASEKHAR.—Sir rule 54 is very clear and it says that the Speaker has to give permission before raising such a matter of public importance and before discussing it in the House. You have not given permission and so he cannot raise the subject.

SRI M. C. NANAIAH.—The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition said that he has raised a specific matter, the specific matter being the findings of the Grover Commission. In this connection, I may bring to the notice of the Speaker a decision which says that an adjournment motion to discuss an enquiry report as a whole has been held as not relating to a specific matter. In the light of this decision, are the findings of the Grover Commission a subject matter? No. It is only an enquiry report. It has been held by the Parliament not to be a specific matter and as such it cannot be entertained. I am answering because he has raised that point. I will leave it at that and seek the ruling of the Chair.

SRI B. N. KENGE GOWDA.—Sri Bommai said that Justice Grover has found the Chief Minister guilty. It is only a report and not a judgment. Therefore, I take objection to that.

SRI V. V. PATTAR.—Sir, Sub-rule (viii) of rule 52 says:

> "the motion shall not raise and question which under the Constitution or these rules can only be raised on a distinct motion by notice given in writing to the Secretary."

So, if it can be raised by a distinct motion then it cannot be raised by way of an adjournment motion. Under rule 153 a no-confidence motion can be moved against a Minister on certain grounds.

MR. SPEAKER.—Why does he presume and what is the stage we are at now ?

SRI V. V. PATTAR.—He has no right move the adjournment motion at all.

MR. SPEAKER.—Please resume your seat.

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—Now, let the Opposition Leader restrict himself to the admissibility of his motion without going into the merits of the case.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition has tabled an adjournment motion and you have been pleased to ask him to give the reasons as to how it could be admitted. To that aspect let him confine himself. If he goes into the merits, the Speaker is there and the House is also there.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಒಂದು ಪರಸ್ಪರ ಒಮ್ಮತಕ್ಕೆ ಬನ್ನಿ. ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇನ್ಯಾರಾದರೂ ವಿಷಯ ಸಮರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸಮಯ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಏನಂ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ ಮುಗಿಸಿಬಿಡಿ.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Sir, the Hon. Chief Minister said that I should confine myself to the aspect of admissibility. But I am sorry to say that some members said that more time should not be taken or that the time should be restricted. This is a matter which we may discuss till the end of the day if the Chair allows. I am extremely astonished that before I make even my preliminary submissions there is so much of obstruction, opposition and objections.

I am not able to understand their anxiety and anguish even before the matter is raised. I think they have come prepared with a preconceived motion and with certain prepared mind. They have not come with open mind. Here, I am duty bound to raise this matter. There are conventions ; there are decisions ; there are rulings of Hon. Speakers of this House, Speakers of the Lok Sabha, as to how in a case of adjournment motion preliminary submission is permitted. It depends upon the importance of the matter, that many times a number of persons are allowed to speak and sometimes even one person makes a submission and it is rejected. It all depends on the importance of the matter. Therefore, it is entirely the discretion of the Speaker to permit how many people should speak.

2 - 30 P. M.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Why all that ?

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—I am saying this because a number of objections have been raised I have heard objections for fortyfive minutes. I will read the rule to prove whether this matter comes within the rule :

> "... ....for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance may be made with the consent of the Speaker."

I restrict myself to the fact that a Commission was appointed by the Government of India. Then another commission was also appointed by the Government of Karnataka under the Chairmanship of Sri Mir Iqbal Hussain. Later on, both the matters covered by the Notification of the State Government were entrusted to Justice Grover. I do not want to go into the history of the case. But I must make a submission while seeking your consent. I cannot argue the matter in a vacuum. I will narrate necessary facts without going into details or merits of the adjournment motion, such matters which are absolutely necessary, to convince you regarding its admissibility.

The Grover Commission has given a finding and the findings are published in the press. If we look into the interim report and alss the final report, the findings of the commission on nearly 9 chargeo has held that the Hon. Chief Minister has misused his authority, there is an act of favouritism, nepotism and act of corruption. I will not go charge by charge. The findings on 9 charges are specific.

SRI HARNAHALLY RAMASWAMY.—Sir, this is the time when the question of giving a finding or ruling on a point of order arises. Now the scope of discussion at this stage would be whether the mover of the motion can go into the merits of the case, I want a ruling.

SRI BHIMANNA KHANDRE.—Is it a point of order ?

MR. SPEAKER.—Nothing may be recorded.****

**** **** ****

(Interruptions)

SRI HARNAHALLY RAMASWAMY.—My point of order is that the mover of the motion can go to the extend of submitting whether it is a matter of urgency and whether it is a matter of public importance. These are the two points on which he has to submit. Apart from this he cannot go into the substance of the matter. If he is permitted to

---

**** Matter not recorded as ordered by the Chair.

mention the charges or details of the charges or findings, as he puts it, then it offends the rule and it amounts to surmounting the mandatory provisions of law and it amounts to exercise of power in a colourable way. Therefore I request the Chair to give a ruling as to whether the mover of this motion can be permitted to go into the merits of the case.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—If we accept the point of order and the assertions made by Sri H. Ramaswamy, then I would have to say Grover Commissions findings are there; it is of great public importance and it is of recent occurrence and sit down. I never expected a state ment or assertion like that from the learned lawyer and senior member in this house on such an adjournment motion. On such important issues submissions have taken place for four or five hours.

SRI D. DEVA RAJ URS.—That cannot be a precedent.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—It cannot be a precedent. But such of the materials and facts which are obsolutely necessary to convince the Chair I must say. I must say how it is of great importance, how it is of recent occurrence, without going into the details of the charges. If Iam not permitted to say even that, how can I show it is a matter of great importance? How can I act in a vacuum? From the beginning I am suggesting to the Chair to hold a class of trainning for the legislators. I am insisting it because we have wasted one hour by raising points of order. They should be taught when such an adjournment motion is given how preliminary submissions are allowed, to what extent the facts are to be narrated

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್.--ಆ ಕ್ಲಾಸಿಗೆ ಯಾರು ಟೀಚರ್ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.--ತಮ್ಮಂಥ ಅನುಭವಸ್ಥರು ಸಿಗಬಹುದು Without mentioning the bare facts how can I convince the Chair? I am only saying how it is of great public importance. I am aware of my own restrictions. I know how far I can go There are conventions.

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—The Chair can give a ruling that what appears in the press we can take up and discuss or all that appears in the papers should not be discussed. I have respect for the Leader of the Opposition. We also know the procedure. We are not here to simply to hear. We have also some intelligence and we know what to speak. Are you prepared to accept that in this House that we can discuss whatever appears in the papers? You kindly give a ruling on that and we will abide by it.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.--ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅಂಥಾ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಬರದಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರಬಹುದು. ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ತರಬಹುದು. ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ಬರುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರ ತಲೆ ಬರುಡೆ ಒಡೆದು ಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಅದು

ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ೯ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ೧೨ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅಡ್ಜರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಮೂಲಕ ರೈಜ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಅದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮಾರನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಬರಬೇಕು, ಇಲ್ಲ ಬಾರದೇ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಕೆಲವೊಂದು ಸುದ್ದಿಗಳು ಏನಿವೆ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ನಮಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಟಿ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಪ್ಪ.--ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಏನಂದರೆ, ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಕೊಟ್ಟರತಕ್ಕ ಸೂಚನೆ ಬಹಳ ಜರೂರಿನಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಂಶಗಳಿಂದ ಒಳಗೊಂಡಿದೆಯೋ ? ಅಥವಾ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡಿದೆಯೋ ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಮಗೆ ಸಮಾಧಾನವಾದರೆ ತಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ನಾನಯ್ಯನವರು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತೀರ್ಪು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಇದು ಜರೂರಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಎಂಬ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ನನಗಂತೂ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಗ್ರೋವರ್ ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರ ವರದಿ ಏನಾಗಬಹುದೆಂಬ ಕಲ್ಪನೆ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.--ನಾನು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಗ್ರೋವರ್ ಕಮೀಷನ್ನಿನ ನಡವಳಿಕೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.--ಹಿಂದೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕೃಷ್ಣಪ್ಪನವರು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಾಗಿದ್ದಾಗ ಗ್ರೋವರ್ ಕಮೀಷನ್ ಆಗಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದವರು ಇವತ್ತು ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ:

**** (ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗೊಂದಲ) ****

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ರೆಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ. ನಾನು ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಸಲಹೆ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದು ಅರೈಸ್ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Sir, I was saying that on 9 charges the Grover Commission has given the findings that the Hon'ble Chief Minister of Karnataka has committed acts of corruption, nepotism, favouritism and mis-use of authority and that his acts are derogatory to the interests of the State. The Government of India has accepted the findings of the Commission and placed the report on the floor of the Lok Sabha. The Government of India-rightly so-- being democratic and having complete faith in the constitutional procedures, has transmitted the Report to the Government of Karnataka for further action. This is very important.

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—Has it been transmitted or is it being transmitted?

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Sir, the Government of India, as I said rightly, under the constitutional procedure, has transmitted the Report for further action to the Government of Karnataka.

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—Sir, I want to know what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition means by transmission ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.--ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಎರಡೆರಡು ವಾಕ್ಯಗಳು ಮುಗಿಯುವುದ

*Matter not recorded as ordered by the Chair.

ರೊಳಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಭಾಸ್ಕರ [illegible] ರವರು ಇಂಟರಪ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ; ಇದರಿಂದ ಸಭಾ ನಾಯಕರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.--ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ನೋಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—Sir, he says definitely that it has been transmitted ; let him say that it is under transmission.

MR. SPEAKER.—The hon. Leader of the Opposition may please convince me as to how it is urgent, how it is of public importance and how it is specific item under Adjournment motion.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Sir, I am not going into the details and merits. I am only narrating the preliminaries and even that is being objected to by some hon. members. I do not know why they are so nervous?

HON. MEMBERS.—No, No.

(Some members of the Ruling Party stood up to speak)

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—Let the hon. member speak the truth and we will accept.

ಒಬ್ಬರು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು.—ಇವರು ಏನು ಈಗ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಜನವರಿಯಲ್ಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅನವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಎಳೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಮಾತನಾಡವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಬಿ. ಬೋರ್ಕರ್.—ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅವರೇನು ಈಲ್ಡ್ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಆಗಲೇ ಹಿರಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ನಾಣಯ್ಯನವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮಾದೇಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಬಹಳ ವಿಷಾದದಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಮನವಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದು ಸಭೆ ನಡೆಯುತಕ್ಕ ತರವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾನೂನುಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕುಳಿತು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಿಗೆ ಹಕ್ಕು ಇದೆ, ಅಂತೆಯೇ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಬಿಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಮನೆಯ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಹಕ್ಕು ಇದೆ. ಅದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ತೀರ್ಪಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯ. ಆದರೆ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿಯೇ, ಇಲ್ಲಿಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ, ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ, ಕಾನೂನು ಇಲ್ಲ, ಎಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ಮಾತಂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ,.........

(ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೊಬ್ಬರು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡೇ ಏನೋ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು)

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮಾದೇಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ.

**** (ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗೊಂದಲ) ****

---

* Matter not recorded as ordered by the Chair.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ರೆಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮಾದೇಗೌಡ.—ಸಭೆ, ಈ ತರಹ ನಡೆಯುವುದಾದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಅನುಮತಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡೇ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮನೆಯ ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಎಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾವ ಸದಸ್ಯರೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡಾಗಲೀ, ಅಥವಾ ಇಬ್ಬರು-ಮೂವರು ಒಟ್ಟೊಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಿಂತುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದು ಯಾವುದೂ ರೆಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮಾದೇಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಬಹಳ ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದ ಈ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ; ಆದರೆ ಇವರು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

(ನಾಲ್ಕಾರು ಮಂದಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೇ ಎದ್ದುನಿಂತು ಮಾತನಾಡತೊಡಗಿದರು)

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ರೆಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ. ****

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಯಹ್ಯಾ.—ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮಾದೇಗೌಡ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರಿಗಾದರೂ ಮಾನ್ಯಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಮಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ನಾವು ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾದರೂ ಬಾಯಿ ತೆಗೆಯಬೇಕಾದರೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಅನುಮತಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಾಯಿ ತೆಗೆಯಬೇಕು ಹಾಗೆ ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದು ಸರಿಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎಂ. ಘಾಡಿ.—ತಾವು ತಮ್ಮ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಏನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಅಥವಾ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಹೇಗೆ ನಡವಳಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರೋ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮಾದೇಗೌಡ.—ನೀವು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಬಾಯಿ ಮುಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—I find today a very warm atmosphere prevailing in this House. I also find on the other side, two categories of people-one very violent and vocal and another silent. I do not know to which group the silent group belongs and to which group the violent group belongs.

HON. MEMBERS.—All belong to one group.

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—I raise a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER.—I cannot allow a point of order to be raised when more than two members are standing.

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—The Hon. leader of the Opposition cannot pass any remarks against us. There are more senior members here who can teach him a lesson.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಗೌರವ ಇದೆ ಏನು !

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನು ನಿಮಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ನೀವು ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರೀತಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯಸನವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ.

*Matter not recorded as ordered by the Chair.

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—The Leader of the Opposition has some fear that some of the members of his party would go over to our side and in this way he is trying to prevent them from coming to our side

SRI P. RAMDEV.—I raise a Point of order. Rule 285 is quite clear on this matter. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಧಾನಸಭೆಯು ಅಧಿವೇಶನ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವಾಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಮಾಡ ಕೂಡದು ಎಂದು ಇದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತಿರುವಾಗ ನೀವು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ನೀವು ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—My freind Sri Bhaskar Naidu said, people are going to his side. I would like to know which side he is going. He is at the crossroad now.

We will come to power, let him not worry. When we come to power Sri Bhaskar Naidu will be with us.

MR. SPEAKER.—The act of corruption and nepotism cannot become subject-matter of an adjournment motion.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—Sir, the Government of India has already taken a decision and they transmit the report for further action to be taken by the government of Karnataka. So the importance of the subject-matter. That is why this is an urgent matter. When the Chief Minister himself is found guilty-I do not use the word (guilty) against him. There are findings against him by the Commission and further enquiry and further action has to be taken by the government of Karnataka. It is in the fitness of things, whether it is according to the democratic convention, whether a fair and impartial enquiry by officers under him and when he is heading the government is possible? Whether he is justified in continuing in the office when the findings are against him and when they are to be investigated and proper action has to be taken. Therefore the question of his continuance in the office even for a moment is of greater importance in view of the findings of the Grover Commission. It is a question propriety and the question and political morality are involved which require to be discussed. Therefore, I am insisting or requesting the Chair that this is a very serious matter affecting the entire administration of this State head by Sri Devaraj Urs. The findings are to be further investigated. Hence the urgeney of the matter.

The next question that is of great importance would be his continuance in the office. So far as the findings are concerned, I do not say they are the final findings of the Court; but they are to be investigated further either by the State Police or by the CBI. The State Government has withdrawn the consent for investigation to be made by the CBI. When this consent with withdrawn, I pointed out of

that time that findings might go against the Chief Minister, the general consent which was given by the Karnataka Government about 20 years ago with withdrawn anticipating the adverse findings. Whether the government of Karnataka will be willing to give consent for investigation by the CBI of the charges, this matter has to be discussed.

If the matter is to be investigated by the State Police, whether it will be an impartial enquiry? There is an old saying "not only justice is to be done but it must seem that justice is being done". Caeser's wife must be above suspicion. The moment the findings were published, I expected, the Chief Minister will quit the office voluntarily. He would have established a laudable convention. What happened when Koiron's report was published? When Das Commission passed certain structures on Mr. Kairon, the then Chief Minister of Punjab, he has resigned though he had done somuch to the Punjab State. He was called to be architect of Punjab State. Similarly, T. T. K. resigned when there was a report against him. But I can't understand why our Chief Minister is clinging to the position. This is a very important matter to be discussed. We will explain the details when the permission is given for discussion.

3-00 P.M.

SRI B. SUBBAYYA SHETTY.—This was their party manifesto during the last election.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—If a man who has misappropriated lakhs of rupees in a society, because of his money power, got elected as the President of that society, can he not be prosecuted or convicted? The Minister for Co-operation take action against such person. Though politically the Government of India could have taken the action, they don't want to take. Because, we are wedded to democracy.

SRI S.M. YAHYA.—Once you have done; and we have seen the results.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—Because you have lost majority the Governor has taken action. Similarly, Government of India imposed President's rule in nine States and declared election. In election, we won yo thumping majority in all those nine states.

SRI S.M. YAHYA.—You talk about Karnataka, Don't talk about other States.

(Interruption)

SRI K.H. RANGANATH.—Let my freind request the Central Government now to dissolve those, party in power and hold fresh elections Can they now do it?

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—Now the final report has come. Let this Assembly be dissolved and fresh election be held.

(Interruption)

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—Firstly, the opposition leader has gone out of the subject. Are we debating that subject? Have we not gone out of the point?

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—When questions are put, I can't swallow without answering. This is a very singular case where the findings have been given against a sitting Chief Minister for which the matter has to be discussed. Perhaps, if I am correct, such an adjournment motion has not moved in any State Legislatures, because such situation has not arisen. Therefore, we will be failing in our duty if we don't take proper action. And if the Adjournment Motion is not permitted to be discussed, perhaps it is a sad day if I may say so.

SRI K.H. RANGANATH.—He can convince the Speaker to give permission. But he can't say that the day is a sad day.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—I want to impress upon the Speaker. This is a very recent matter which has been published yesterday; it is a matter of public importance, because the Chief Minister of our State is involved; and it is a matter of urgency. because investigation has to be done by the State Government. For that if he continues in office it is not helpful for a fair and impartial enquiry The details will come when permission for discussion is given.

SRI K.H. RANGANHTH.—I don't think I am offending the hon. Member. What was the situation when the Rajya Sabha passed a resolution against the Prime Minister? Do you consider it as the same? Are you dare enough to say that the resolution of the Rajya Sabha should be adhered? There is no point in using such words here.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—I am not holding any brief for the Prime Minister.But I challenge that there was nobody in party to give the charges in writing.

SRI K.H. RANGANATH.—His own party member, the present Deputy Prime Minister-Mr. Charan Singh has made that allegation. What more do you want?

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—No; no. It was not like that.

MR. SPEAKER.—Why you should go to that subject?

SRI A. LAKSHMI SAGAR.—When the Minister raised certain points unconnected with the subject before the House, the Leader of the Opposition will have to reply. When you allow the Minister to make

such remarks, you should also allow the opposition leader to rebut it. The Minister has raised a matter which has no relevance, no connection and no germane to the main subject. To rebut it you don't allow the leader of the opposition.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಒಂದು ನಿಮಿಷ ಯೀಲ್ಡ್ ಆಗುವುದಾದರೆ. Sir, I asked you whether he would yield and after he yielded, with your permission, I said it.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—I would like to tell my friend that he yielded. But the Leader of the Opposition must also be permitted to rebut the unfounded and mischievous allegations made.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—The Hon'ble Minister for Parliamentary Affairs has said about applying standars. I agree with him that for everybody there should be the same standard, whether the political leader is the Chief Minister, or the Prime Minister or the Home Minister. In the case of the Prime Minister, as far as I know, not even the Deputy Prime Minister has made any allegations. He had send allegations published in the press...

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್ ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ತಾವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕೇಳಿ, ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿರಲಿ, ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿರಲಿ, ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಿಂದ ಸೈನ್ ಹಾಕಿ ಅಲಿಗೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಕಮೀಷನ್ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಪ್ರಧಾನಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದವರೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ನೀತಿ, ಮನೋಧೈರ್ಯ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದು, in this case, we, the Legislators of the Opposition submitted a signed memorandum to Government of India, The investigation is based not only on the allegations and reports of the Committee but on a signed memorandum, making allegations against him. We cannot make wild allegations without signatures, Nobody takes care of it.

SRI S. M. YAHYA.—Rajya Sabha or Lok Sabha is much more than your signatures.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Apart from that now that matter has been referred to the retired Justice of the Supreme Court, action has been taken by the Prime Minister.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮತ್ತೆ ತಾವು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ...

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ೨ ಗಂಟೆಯಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ತಾವು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಒಂದು ಮಾತನಾಡಿಲ್ಲ...

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್.—ನನಗೆ ಹೇಳುವ ಬದಲು ಹಿಂದೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ? ನಾವು ಮತ್ತೆ ಸೊಲ್ಲು ಎತ್ತೋದಿಲ್ಲ, ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ,

ಅಕ್ಷರಶಃ ೧೦೦ಕ್ಕೆ ೧೦೦ರಷ್ಟು ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧರಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದೇರೀತಿ ಆ ಒಂದು ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಆ ಕಡೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿಸಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಎರಡು ಕಡೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ...

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್.—ಕೇಳಿ ದೇವ್ರು...

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ್.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನು ಸಂಭೋದನೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ದೇವ್ರು ಅಂತ ಸಂಬೋಧನೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್.—ದೇವ್ರು ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಬಾರದೆ ?

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—I rise to a Point of order. The Speaker should be addressed either as 'Hon'ble Speaker or its equivalent" ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ "Addressing him as" ಕೇಳಿದೇವ್ರು "is not parliamentary, and sh uld not be used. I press for a ruling.

MR. SPEAKER.—You may address the Chair as 'Mr. Speaker' or 'ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ'.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ತಮಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇದೆ, ದೇವ್ರು ಅಂತ ಸಂಭೋದನೆ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ಅಸಭ್ಯ ಮಾತು, ಅನ್ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಅಂತ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ನೀವು ಅಪೋಜಿಷನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಅಂತ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಗಂಟು ಮೂಟೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತೇವೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—If you presume like that, what can I do? I cannot help.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—He has no right to raise the point.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ 'ದೇವ್ರು' ಅನ್ನುವ ಪದವನ್ನು ಸಂಬೋಧನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ್.—ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಕ್ರಮಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಕೆಲವು ಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ಬಳಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಮೀಟಿಂಗ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ದೇವ್ರು, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ನೂರು ಬಾರಿ ಕೇಳಿ ದೇವ್ರು, ಕೇಳಿ ಅಪ್ಪ ಅನ್ನುವ ಪದವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ರಂಗನಾಥ್‌ರವರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ದೇವ್ರು ಅನ್ನುವ ಬದಲು ದೆವ್ವ ಅಂತ ಅನ್ನಬಹುದೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹೆಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ್.—ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳನ್ನು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಎರಡೂ ಮನೆಗಳ ಅನುಭವ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಇದೆ, ಯಾವ ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ಬಳಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆ ? The tone in which Mr. Laxmisagar has said is not correct, I want him to address me as Speaker'.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Sir, this is a very historic occasion and in my view it is an unprecedented occasion wherein an adjournment motion in respect of the findings against a sitting Chief Minister have to be discussed. Therefore, it is of utmost, paramount importance that the matter be discussed in detail. Nobody can dispute that it is of recent occurrence. On the question of public importance, it

affects the Chief Minister, who heads the Government. Therefore, it is of great public importance and further action has to be taken by the State Government itself. Investigation will have to be made. Therefore, his continuance in office, according to me is not correct. When the Speaker permits, I will make my statement and give my own reasons why, in the fitness of things, he should voluntarily and gracefully step down from office. After hearing my reasons, I am sure, the Chief Minister will voluntarily step down and make room for a fair and impartial enquiry against himself and thus, perhaps, he may go into the history as the greatest democrat in this country.

Unless a full dressed discussion is permitted, it is not possible. I am only submitting that this matter is of great public importance. The urgency is, his continuing as a Chief Minister. We want to make out a point so that he has to voluntarily step down from Office and the urgency is that the matter is to be settled early. In view of all these things, I would urge the Chair to give consent to this Motion so that a full detailed debate could be held wherein we can place our view-points which will be appreciated by the entire House and he may agree after hearing us. In this connection, I would like to read some portion from what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru wrote to Sri Krishnamachari. Later on, Sri T. T. Krishnamachari resigned from the Union Cabinet.

Nehru says : "Despite the clear findings of the Commission, so far you are concerned, I am most convinced that your part in this matter was the smallest and you did not even know what was done".

In spite of Panditji's letter to him, he resigned. Panditji said that your part is very little and perhaps, you might not have bnown it. He wrote that letter after the Chagla Commission's report. But still, T.T.K. resigned.

Such conventions have been laid down by the great people in this country. Therefore, we have to see that such conventions are laid down. This being the matter of great urgent public importance, I am sure and I am confident the Chair will use its judicious discretion and permit the discussion on this motion and postpone the other matters which are before the House.

† SRI K. H. SRINIVAS.— I have heard with rapt attention the submissions made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition The House is very well aware of the principles and the rules that govern the admission of an adjournment motion and also the limited scope.

that any Member of this House. While seeking to pursue the Chair for admitting a particular motion can indulge in. By his own submissions, the Hon. Leader of the Oppossion has also said that he wanted to make a submission within the ambit of this rule and don't want to go into the merits of any question. He was supposed to convince this August House of the urgency of the public importance of a definite matter.

SRI S. R BOMMAI.— I rise on a point of order. I am to convince the Chair and not the House sofar as the permission is concerned.

SRI K. H. SRINIVAS.— After all, the Chair will not function in isolation in a Parliamentary Democracy. After all, the Chair symbolises the sense of the House or the consenses of the House. If you only want to pursue the Chair, then, that could be very well done in his chambers ; and why is it done on the floor of the House ? While trying to pursue the Chair, the other objective is to take the House into confidence also because the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, time and again mentioned that all the Member will join him or will be convinced, Those phrases were also employed. I have no objection. He was supposed to convince the Chair about the urgency ; about the public importance ; about the fact that the motion is sought to be in respect of a definite matter of public impartance which is of recent occurrence.

My submission to the Chair with due respect to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is that he has miserably failed in supporting any one of these points. The sum and substance of all that he has tried and all that is attempted is to make out a case of propriety and to make out a case of want of confidence in the Chief Minister. These are two different propositions wholly unconnected with the adjorunment motion portion is concerned.

Sofar as propriety is concerned, he said that Caesar's wife must be above suspicion. This is the norm which all of us to accept. That is why, our Hon Minister for Parliamentary Affairs was pleased to bring it to the notice of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition the monumental example of the Prime Minister of this country compromising with the erst-while Home Minister after washing all the dirty linens on the roads......

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.— I rise on a point of order. Is it under the scope of the discussion ? Is it relevant to the matter which is before us ? The debate will go astray if they are permitted to say about the Prime Minister and other things. He said about the Prime Minister of India and compromising with the Dy. Prime Minister and

all those things. I would like to know whether all those things are relevant to the subject matter ?

MR SPEAKER.— Not necessary.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.— When any Member says anything, you are quick enough to pull him up. I therefore request you to pull them up also......

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.— It is only to a limited extent. The adjournment motion is based on the press reports and he is also making allegations on the basis of the points which have been placed before the House through the Press, viz,. the allegations made by the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.- I would like to say about the normal practice that we been following in this House. In this House, we are not permitted to say anything about the Members of the Lok Sabha or the Ministers. If the Hon. Minister Sri Srinivas wants to say all those things, let him go to the Parliament and make a speech or ask the M. Ps to raise it. About relevancy, I never went into the details. I restricted myself to the point but now they go on saying about the Prime Minister and the Home minister and other affairs. It those things are allowed, the Chair will have to allow others from this side also to say something.

SRI K H. SRINIVAS.— I have the least intention of dragging the names of either the Prime Minister or the Home Minister, whosoever it may be. I am only trying to make a very limited reference because I cannot help making that much of reference. If I could have avoided. I would have surely tried to do it ; because the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was pleading on a question of propriety and he said that the Caesar's wife should be above board. I would like to remind him of another saying that men in glass houses should not try to pelt stones on others. When it is a question of political morality, when it is a question of preaching others, only those persons who have practised it and demonstrated it to the whole world can attempt that. We are certainly very humble and prepared to learn propriety from proper people. That is all. We are not against propriety but it is to be taught by proper people only.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.— I rise to a point of order. Here I have made a statement. Let my hon Friend accepts it. I am here in politics for the last 25 years. I have moved the adjournment motion. Let him say anything about my public life if he has got anything. Let him say whether I have committed any error or indulged in corrupt practices or nepotism etc., if he has got sufficient materials.

I have made the statement. I am prepared to resign if my friend has got anything to say against me I have moved this adjournment motion. It is a question of propriety.

† SRI M. V. RAJASEKHARAN.— Sir, I raise a point of order. Hon. Minister Sri K. H. Srinivas while submitting his arguments before this house has attributed motives to the Leader of the Opposition, It is a clear insinuation against the Leader of the Opposition. The Hon. Minister has stated if at all they want to learn the principles of propriety they are prepared to learn if, it comes from proper people. That means to say our Leader of the Opposition is not a proper person. It is a clear insinuation attributed against our Leader of the Opposition. So, my humble submission to the Chair is that let the Hon. Minister while submitting his arguments exercise some kind of restraint. We cannot tolerate this kind of insinuations against our Leader. Therefore, I request the Chair to pull him up.

3-30 P. M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರ ರೆಡ್ಡಿ.— ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್‌ರವರು ತಾವು ಒಬ್ಬ ಸತ್ಯ ಹರಿಶ್ಚಂದ್ರನ ಮೊಮ್ಮಗ ಎಂದು ಅಂದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಯಾರ ಮೊಮ್ಮಗ ಎಂದು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು.— ನೀವು ಯಾರ ಮೊಮ್ಮಗ ಎಂಬುದು ನಮಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.— ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಸ್ಪರ ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕ ವಿಷಯ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ ;

ಶ್ರೀ ಗಟ್ಟಿ ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ್.— ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಗಟ್ಟಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಗ್ಯಾಲರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರೇಕ್ಷಕರು ನೋಡಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಬಹಳ ಜೋರಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ವಕೀಲ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಾದ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ಜೋರಾಗಿ ಮೇಜು ಕುಟ್ಟುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಇದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಆ ವಕೀಲರಿಗೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದರು. "If you have got facts, hammer the facts. If you have got the law in your favour hammer the law. If you do not have either hammer the desk" ಎಂದು,

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.— Sir, I want a ruling from the Chair. The whole matter has been raised on the basis of newspaper reports. Could it be discussed here. If so, here afterwards are we permitted to bring before the House for discussion based on the news paper reports. I want a ruling on this point.

MR. SPEAKER.— The Hon. Leader of the Opposition and others have given notice. So, I have to give them an opportunity about the admissibility of their notice.

† SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU. - Mr. Speaker, Sir, my point of order is that whether this House could discuss matters based on the news paper reports. That is my submission,

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.— ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್‌ರವರಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನದೊಂದು ಸವಿನಯ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಪ್ರೊಪ್ರೈಟಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನನ್ನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರೇ ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಈ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನನ್ನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಭಿಮಾನ, ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇದೆ. ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದುಕೊಂಡು ಏನಾದರೂ ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಿಕೊಡಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನೀವು ಇಂಥ ರಾಜಕೀಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ದುಡ್ಡು ಹೊಡೆದಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಕಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟ್ ಕೊಡಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಇಷ್ಟು ದುಡ್ಡು ಲಂಚ ಹೊಡೆದಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಅಥವಾ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಂದ ಇಷ್ಟು ದುಡ್ಡು ಹೊಡೆದಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಏನಾದರೂ ಸಾಕ್ಷ್ಯಾಧಾರಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹೇಳಿ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಅಂಥಾ ಯಾವ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಲು ನನಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಬಲವಿಲ್ಲ ; ನೈತಿಕ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ; ನಾನು ಒಬ್ಬ ಸಣ್ಣ ಮನುಷ್ಯ. ಆದರೂ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಈ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಪ್ಪಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನನಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ನನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರೊಪ್ರೈಯಿಟಿ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಪರೋಕ್ಷವಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ನನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾದರೂ ಇಂಥ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ಲಂಚಾವತಾರ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಅವರು ತೋರಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಈಗಲೇ ನನ್ನ ರಾಜಿನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹೊರಟುಹೋಗುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.— ಈ ಸದನದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಅನುಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದು ಈ ಸದನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಸದನದ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಅಗೌರವ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್‌ರವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯ ಛಾಲೇಂಜ್ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು ಇವರ ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣಿಕತೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿರುವ ಪದವನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್‌ರವರು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

SRI K. H. SRINIVAS.— Sir, in view of what the Leader of the Opposition and others have said I have to explain a bit with that aspect of the matter. When I referred to proprirty and proper person it need not refers to the Leader of the Opposition. I have highest regard and respect for him. I know he is a man of integrity and honesty. In case if it is really wounded his feelings I humbly withdraw that word, Because I have no quarrels the.e. Since the question involved here refers to a sort of political morality and propriety that is being preached over the country I made a reference to that aspect in that context. I only said that we got to take proper view of the matter. We cannot just isolate one thing and say this is proper and we should that thing and all. That was the sum and substance. I was trying to convince and I said when we preach some political prorpiety that should carry conviction with the people without double standards or threeble standards being applied to it. I hope I have made the point clear.

Then, I come to the public importancae. What public importance this report has got ? So far as State of Karnataka is concerned, this report has lost all its importance let alone public importance. Because the report has become so stale. Hon. Leader of the Opposition was pleased to quote from the Jurisprudence and submitted that justice must be done not only to be done must be shown to have been done. The Government of India while appointing Commissions should

have certainly thought of things that would happen. So far as public of Karnataka is concerned that is very much demonostrated not by shouting or speeches but in the polls. Therefore, after publishing the report and also in between the preliminary and final report I do not think that there is any big change as has been anticipated by the Members on the other side. After all people have always seems to have been anticipated the results and the verdict of the Commission. So, in the eye of public, Grover Commission's report honestly has no significance and has no importance.

So far as the urgency is concerned the Leader of the Opposition has stated that the Chief Minister cannot be rest with the power any longer. That is what I have understood. But to me such a kind of urgency does not arise. If it is the question of trust in the Chief Minister, then the only mode available for the Leader of the Opposition is to move a no confidence motion against the Government. Therefore, my submission is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has failed to make a case for urgency or public importance or a definite matter of recent occurrence, On all these points he has not been able to substantiate his arguments. In a way I should say this Grover Commission was the first to get favouritism by the Government of India because the Janata Party has failed in this State.

This Grover Commision's final report is the last straw on the camel's back so far as Karnataka is concerned. Therefore, I can very well understand the anxiety on the part of the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition but we are unable to see any rhym or reason in the arguments that he has advanced.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ಜಗತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯಾಯ ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿಯೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಪ್ರತ್ಯಕ್ಷವಾಗಿ ಅಂಧಕಾರ ಉಂಟಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್‌ರವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಜನರು ಓಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಗೆದ್ದು ಬಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು, ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಯಾರ ಮೇಲೆ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅವರು ಅಧಿಕಾರಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಫೇವರಿಟಿಸಮ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನೆಂಟರಿಷ್ಟರಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳು ಸಾಬೀತಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ರವರು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಯಾರ ಹತೋಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅವರೇ ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಗುರಿಯಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ದೂರ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೇ ನಿಷ್ಪಕ್ಷಪಾತವಾದ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆಯವರೇ ನೋಟೀಸ್‌ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡಿ, ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಸ್ಕೋಪ್ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ.

(ಹಲವಾರು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತು ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು)

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ಅವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇರಬಾರದು, ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಚ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್.—ಓಟಿನಿಂದ ನಿರ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಭೀಮಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆಯವರು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಶ್ರೀ ಜಾರ್ಜ್ ಫರ್ನಾಂಡೀಸ್‌ರವರ ಕೇಸನು

ವಾಪಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರಲ್ಲ, ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣಕೊಟ್ಟರು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಕೇಸನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ದೇಶದ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಚ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್.—ಯಾವುದೇ ವಿಚಾರ ಬಂದರೂ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಇರಲಿ, ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಇರಲಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನೇ ಕೇಳತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ನೂರಾರು ತಪ್ಪುಗಳು ಸಿಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ನಾನು ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಇದ್ದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್‌ರವರು ಶ್ರೀ ಜಾರ್ಜ್ ಫರ್ನಾಂಡಿಸ್‌ರವರ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಇಂದಿರಾಗಾಂಧಿಯವರು ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾಗ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಳದ ತಲೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಹೊಡೆದರು, ಕರುಣಾನಿಧಿಯವರ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಉರುಳಿಸಿದರು, ಅನೇಕ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಳ ವನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಚೆಂಡಾಡಿದರು, ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಜನರನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಜೈಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರು ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ತಾವು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಶ್ರೀ ಜಾರ್ಜ್ ಫರ್ನಾಂಡಿಸ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಅವರು ಸುಭಾಸ್‌ಚಂದ್ರ ಭೋಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದಂಥ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೋರಾಟ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಪರ್ಸನಲ್ ರೆಫರೆನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಕಾಲ, ಸಮಯ ಹೋಗಿಬಿಡುತ್ತದೆ. ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಇದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಮುಗಿಸೋಣ.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—When laws become intolerable it is the duty of the people to overthrow them. He was attempted to overthrow tyrany ; therefore he was a hero.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು ಏನು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಸಿ. ನಾಣಯ್ಯ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೆ ತಾವು ಆ ಕಡೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ನಮಗೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿದರೆ, ನಾವು ಕೂಡ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—From the beginning the hon. Member Sri Nanaiah is rather threatening the Chair. The Chair has discretion to permit as many members to speak as possible.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಸಿ. ನಾಣಯ್ಯ.—ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಪುನಃ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವು ದಾದರೆ ನಮಗೂ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಾದರೆ ನಮಗೇ ಮೊದಲು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮಾದೇಗೌಡ.—ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ನೀಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡ ತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಹೊಸ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವೇನಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಈ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ. ಒಂದೆಲ್ಲ ಎರಡು ಗಂಟೆಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಕುಳಿತು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೇ ಬಿಡಬೇಕೇ ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ನಿದರ್ಶನಗಳು ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟಿವೆ. ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಮಹತ್ವವಾದ ವಿಷಯ.

ಆಡಳಿತಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರೊಬ್ಬರು.—ಇದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮಹತ್ವವಾದ ವಿಚಾರ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮಾದೇಗೌಡ.—ಹೌದು. ಈ ತರಹ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಎದ್ದು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ, ಕೂಗಿದರೆ ನಾವು ಬಗ್ಗುತಕ್ಕ ಜನ ಅಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟ ಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಾವು ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೊತ್ತು ಎರಡೂ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೇ ಬಿಡಬೇಕೇ ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವರು ನೀವು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್ ಅವರು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾನ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಯಾವಾಗ ತರಬೇಕು, ಹೇಗೆ ತರಬೇಕು, ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಹೇಗೆ, ಒಪ್ಪದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಹೇಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ನಾವು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಆ ಕಡೆ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಈ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಚಾರವಾದುದರಿಂದ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ತಾವು (ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು) ಆ ಪೀಠದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ತಮ್ಮ ಪೀಠದ ಮೇಲೆ ತಕ್ಕಡಿ ಇದೆ. ತಕ್ಕಡಿಯ ಸಂಕೇತ ನ್ಯಾಯವನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ತಾವು ನ್ಯಾಯವನ್ನು ತೂಗುವವರು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಇದು ನಮಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ನಮಗೆ ಯಾವುದು ಮುಖ್ಯವೋ ಅದು ಅವರಿಗೆ (ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ) ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗದೇ ಇರಬಹುದು. ದೇಶದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದು ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಹೊತ್ತಿನಿಂದ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ತಾವು ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಎರಡನ್ನೂ ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇವತ್ತು ನಾವು ಏನು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ಮೂಲಕ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಅದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಭಾಸ್ಕರ ನಾಯಿಡು ಅವರು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಾಯಿಡು ಅವರನ್ನು ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾವು ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ವೆಂಕಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇದೆ. ನೀವು ಯಾತಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಿ ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮಾದೇಗೌಡ.—ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಅವರು ಅಭಿನಂದನೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಗಲಿ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

(ಆ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಲವಾರು ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಒಂದೇ ಸಮನೆ ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡ ತೊಡಗಿದರು. ಯಾವುದೂ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ.)

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇಷ್ಟಬಂದ ಹಾಗೆ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಸಭ್ಯತೆಯಿಂದ ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಘನತೆ ಗೌರವಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೂ ಕಲಿತು ಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲವೇ ? I am very sorry for the attitude of some Members.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮಾದೇಗೌಡ.—ತಾವು (ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು) ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ urgent public importance ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ನಾವು ಇವತ್ತು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇದನ್ನು ಎತ್ತುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಸಾರಿ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರದೇ ಇರುವ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೂಡ ನಾವು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನ ಸೆಳೆದು ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಇವೆ. ಇದನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ತಾವು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಗ್ರೋವರ್ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅದು ಇವತ್ತು ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯ. ಇದು ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ನನ್ನ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಗಟ್ಟಿ ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಮಾದೇಗೌಡರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಕೂಗಾಡಿದರೆ ಗಲಾಟೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಾವು ಹೆದರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಾನು ಅದನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಸಾರಿ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಅವರು ಏನೂ ಹೆದರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಗ್ರೋವರ್ ವರದಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಪ್ರತಿಕ್ರಿಯೆಯನ್ನು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯವರು ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ–ದಂಡಿಗೆ ಹೆದರಲಿಲ್ಲ ದಾಳಿಗೆ ಹೆದರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾತನ ಕುಲುಮೆಗೆ ಹೆದರುತ್ತೇನೆಯೋ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮಾದೇಗೌಡ.—ನೀವು ದಂಡಿಗೂ ಹೆದರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ದಾಳಿಗೂ ಹೆದರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ದೆವ್ವಕ್ಕೂ ಹೆದರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಪಿಶಾಚಿಗೂ ಹೆದರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಯಾವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಹೆದರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಗಟ್ಟಿ ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ್.—ಅವರ ಕುರ್ಚಿ ಬಿರುಕುಬಿಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ತರಹ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ನನಗೊಂದೂ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ನೀವು ನೀವೇ ಎದ್ದು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ?

†SRI M.C. NANAIAH.—Hon. Speaker, the Leader of the opposition along with other members have given notice to adjourn the proceedings of this House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance relating to the findings of the Grover Commission. I do not want to stray myself into certain extraneous matters. I would be well within my limits if I can just place before the Speaker certain rulings of our own Parliament relating to the very same issue. In the first place, whether it is an urgent matter, whether this matter has arisen out of some emergency. i.e., urgent in its practical sense. The Leader of the Opposition said that the matter is urgent because the Leader of the House, the Chief Minister is continuing in office. It is not an urgent matter. I want to know what is the urgency that has arisen. Grover Commission was set up two years back and it has given a report about two months back. That means the Grover Commission was functioning for well over a period of two years and much more than anything else immediately after the Commission was constituted after the dissolution of the Assembly by the Central Government, an interim report was given in respect of certain charges and the Commission has also given its interim report. About two months back it has given its final report and it has been presented in the Parliament yesterday, and it is only in continuation of the previous interium report. Nothing else. So, where is the urgency. If for instance Grover had given report yesterday without giving an interim report to the Parliament, then I can say it is an urgent matter. I say it has lost urgency because it is only continuation of the previous interim report and as such the matter is not urgent, Now to find out whether the matter is urgent it requires, adjournment of the proceedings of the House. The members on the opposition side have ample opportunities to discuss, to dilate on the issue when the

subjects of Chief Minister will be taken up on the floor of the House within a period of seven or eight days.

There are portfolios attached to the Chief Minister and the Demands are going to be discussed within a period of 6 or 7 days, and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and such of those members who want to speak can definitely speak on that. That is what even the Parliament has held. At a page 431 of the book 'Practice and Procedure' by Kaul and Shakdar it is stated as follows :

4-00 P.M.

"It has been held that an adjournment motion on a matter which can be raised during debate on the motion of thanks on the President's Address, budget discussion (i), motion on international situation (j), motion regarding a matter of public importance such as food policy, etc, (k) to be held in the same session is not in order."

The Adjournment Motion has been given. The matter is not urgent. They have ample opportunities to discuss on the Demands of the Chief Minister himself. Where is the necessity to adjourn the proceedings of this House ? As far as that matter is concerned, it is not there.

About the question of public importance, what is the public importance in this particular thing ? The entire State of Karnataka, three crores people of Karnataka, for the last two years, have been seeing in the Press or otherwise the proceedings or otherwise of the Grover Commission. Much more than anything else, even today people know that a particular building is named as 'Grover Commission Building' where the proceedings of the Commission had taken place, and where the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Sri Lakshmisagar and others have actively participated in the very deliberations of the Commission itself. These things have been highlighted through the Press. Sir, 'Public importance' for whom ? It is for the people and citizens of Karnataka, not to anybody else. The people of Karnataka have been in the know of these things for the last two years. Where is public importance involved in it ? So, I say it has lost its public importance ; there is no public importance either.

Then I would like to deal about 'definite matter.' I have already stated that the thing that is sought to be discussed by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and others is an enquiry report of a Commission, the findings of a Commission are manifold, numerous reasons are given and numerous other things are there. Is it one

particular matter? I would like to read for the information of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and others from Kaul and Shakdar. at page 429, it is stated as under :

> "An adjournment motion to discuss an enquiry report as a whole has been held as not relating to a specific matter."

All these three things are not there. So, to conclude Mr. Speaker, whatever the Leader of the the Opposition or other Members wanted to speak about the propriety, morality and other things, I would only say that these are all political philosophies not only known to us but known to the world. Political philosophies differ from person to person and party to party. There cannot be one yardstick for the entire nation or universe. I would only say that this is not a matter which requires the proceedings of the House to be adjourned. I appeal to you, Sir, not to give consent for this.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಇವತ್ತು ಈ ಸದನದ ಮುಂದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ನಾಯಕರು ಏನೊಂದು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತಮಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅಡ್ಮಿಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ದಯಮಾಡಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಅತ್ತಕಡೆಯ ನನ್ನ ಮಿತ್ರರು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ವಾದ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವ ಅಗತ್ಯ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಆ ವಾದದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ವಿಧವಾದ ತಿರುಳು ಇಲ್ಲ. ಹುರುಳು ಇಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಾನಯ್ಯ ಹಾಗೂ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್..........

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕಂತಹ ವಾದವಲ್ಲಿ ತಿರುಳಿಲ್ಲ. ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಗ್ರೋವರ್ ಕಮೀಷನ್‌ರವರು ಏನೊಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಆ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ ಮೇಲೆ, ಅದರ ತೀರ್ಪು ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಉದ್ಭವವಾಗಿರುವಂತಹ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ ? ಎಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಮುಖವಾಗಿದೆ ಇದರ ತೀವ್ರತೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ವಿಷಾದಪಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ ಇಡೀ ಭಾರತದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಎದ್ದಿರತಕ್ಕಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬೇರೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಎದ್ದಿತ್ತೇ ? ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಉದಾಹರಿಸಿ ತೋರಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಿ ; ಇಡೀ ಮೂರು ಕೋಟಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಜನತೆ ಕಾದು ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ತೀರ್ಪು ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡುವವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ ? ನಾಳೆ ಬೆಳಗ್ಗೆಪೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಸ್ಥಾನವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಟ್ಟು, ಆ ಸ್ಥಾನದಿಂದ ಇಳಿದು ಬಂದು ಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೇನೋ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಜನ ಕಾದು ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

SRI B. N. KENGE GOWDA.—It is only a Report not a judgement!

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಅವರ ತೀರ್ಪನ್ನು ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಾಗ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಸತ್ಯವಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಅದು ಸಾಬೀತಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಒಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ತೀವ್ರ ತರವಾದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಯಾರ ಮೇಲೆ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಇದೆಯೋ ಅವರೇ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೂ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಗೃಹ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಆಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಒಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿದೆ. ಆ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನ

ತಕ್ಕಂತಹ ವರದಿ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಮುಂದೆ ಆ ವರದಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಯಾರ ಮೇಲೆ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಇದೆಯೊ ? ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದುದು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಇವರು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಗೆ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ? ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವವರು ಯಾರು ? ಬೇರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೂ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಇದೆ. ಬೇರೆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಉಳಿದಂತಹ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೂ ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳಿವೆ. ಇದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಸೇರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾರು ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ? ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಕಮೀಷನ್ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೋದು ಇನ್‌ಫೆರೆನ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಫೈಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರ ಪ್ರೊಪ್ರಾಯಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದುದು ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಆಪಾದಿತರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಆಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಿತ್ರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಯಾವ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲೇ ಪ್ರಥಮ ಬಾರಿಗೆ ಇಂತಹ ವಿಚಾರ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಬೇರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಮೇಲೂ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ತಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ತಾವೇ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಒಂದು ತೀವ್ರವಾದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ದಯಮಾಡಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿನೋಡಿ. ಇದು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಮಹತ್ತರವಾದ ವಿಚಾರ ಮತ್ತು ದಯಮಾಡಿ ತಾವು ಆಳವಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿ, ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳು ಸಾಬೀತಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತನಿಖೆ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕು. ಅದು ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋದಾಗ ತಪ್ಪಿತಸ್ಥರು ಯಾರು ಎಂಬುದು ಸಾಬೀತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಗ್ರೋವರ್ ಕಮೀಷನ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ವರದಿ ಸರಿಯೋ ತಪ್ಪೋ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡೋಣ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯ ತಕ್ಕಂಥದ್ದು ಸರಿಯೇ ? ಅವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಜೀಜ್ ಶೇಠ್.—ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ನೋಡಿ ;

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಪೊಲಿಟಿಕಲ್ ಮೊರಾಲಿಟಿಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾಗಿದೆ. ಬಿಳಿ ಬಟ್ಟೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ತೊಟ್ಟು ಇಂಕನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ ಬಟ್ಟೆಯೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೊಳಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಇಂಕನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅದು ಒಂದು ತರಹ ಕಲರ್ ಆಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮೊರಾಲಿಟಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಳಕಳಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ ದಯಮಾಡಿ ಆ ಸ್ಥಾನದಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಬನ್ನಿ. ಈ ಒಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಒಂದು ದಿಟ್ಟತನವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಸಿ.ಬಿ.ಐ. ತನಿಖೆಗೆ ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ಆಫರ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI K. H. SRINIVAS.—I raise a point of order. My point of order is, whatever discussion that is allowed should be with reference to the admission of the adjournment motion; demanding the resignation of the Chief Minister cannot become part and parcel of the adjournment motion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಕೆ. ಕಳ್ಳಿಗುಡ್ಡ.—ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೇ ವಿನಾ ಮೊರಾರ್ಜಿ ದೇಸಾಯಿ ಮತ್ತು ಜಾರ್ಜ್ ಫರ್ನಾಂಡಿಸ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೇ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಅವರು ಈ ಕ್ಷಣದಿಂದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಯಂತ್ರವನ್ನು ಚಾಲು ಮಾಡುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಾ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ.........

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಕೆ. ಕಳ್ಳಿಗುಡ್ಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದನ್ನೇ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬೇರೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದೇ ಇಲ್ಲಾ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು:—ತಾವು ಬೇಗ ಮುಕ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಒಂದು ದಿಟ್ಟತನವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಅವರು ಸಿ.ಬಿ.ಐ. ತನಿಖೆಗೆ ತಮನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಅವರು ತನಿಖೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲಾ. ಅದನ್ನು ಹಿಂದಕ್ಕೇನೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರು. ಆ ಒಂದು ದಿಟ್ಟತನವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ದಿಟ್ಟತನವನ್ನು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ತೋರಿಸಬಾರದು ? ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ತೋರಿಸಿದರೆ ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಈ ಒಂದು ಆಪಾದನೆ ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಈ ಕ್ಷಣದಿಂದ ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲಾ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ವೆಂಕಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಮೊದಲು ಜಾರ್ಜ್ ಫರ್ನಾಂಡಿಸ್‌ರವರ ಹತ್ತಿರ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ತಮಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ಮತ್ತು ಅಭಿಮಾನ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಏತಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅವರ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರಮಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಸಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಒಂದು ಆಪಾದನೆ ಬಂದಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ಸದನದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದರ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಯಾಂಕ್ಟಿಟಿ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಅದು ಧೂಳೀಪಟವಾದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಈ ಕ್ಷಣದಿಂದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಆಡಳಿತ ಯಂತ್ರವನ್ನು ಸುಸೂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲಾ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ವೆಂಕಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಮೊದಲು ಜಾರ್ಜ್ ಫರ್ನಾಂಡಿಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಛಾರ್ಜ್‌ಷೀಟ್ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವರನ್ನೇ ತಂದು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದಿರಿ.........

(ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ೪-೫ ಜನ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು)

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ೪-೫ ಜನ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಇದು ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಗೌರವ ತರತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದಲ್ಲ.

SRI K. H. SRINIVAS.—I am once again constrained to raise a point of order because the hon. member Sri Ananda Rao has been persistently insisting on one point, about asking the Chief Minister or Persuading him to resign. He is pleading so much, better he gives a separate petition to the Chief Minister. He should not take the valuable time of the House. It is not only we the members behind the Chief Minister but the Hon. member can safely presume that the vast majority of people of our State are behind him.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಕೆ. ಹೆಚ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್‌ರವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ನಿಷ್ಠೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಸುಹೊಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ತೋರಿಸಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಇದೇ ಆತ್ಮನಿಷ್ಠೆಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಿ ಈ ಒಂದು ಅಡ್ಜರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಅನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕಂಥದ್ದು ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಅಲ್ಲಾ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಗಟ್ಟಿ ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ್.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಅವರು ಹೇಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಲಿ. ಆದರೆ ಚಾಮುಂಡಿ ಬೆಟ್ಟದ ಮೇಲಿರುವ ಮಹಿಷಾಸುರ ಮರ್ದಿನಿ ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಹಾವಭಾವವನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಲಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಮಕ್ಕಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೆದರಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗಟ್ಟಿಯವರು ಕನ್ನಡಕ ಹಾಕಿ ಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲಾ ಅಂತ ಕಾಣುತ್ತೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿ ದೋಷದಿಂದ ನನ್ನನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಕನ್ನಡಕವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾನು ಭೀಮನಂತೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ, ಅದು ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮಹಿಷಾಸುರ ಮರ್ಧಿನಿ ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹೀಗೆ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಇಂಟರ್‌ಪ್ರೆಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ಈ ದಿನದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದು ಹೇಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ? ಅವರು ಬೇಗನೆ ಮುಕ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಒಂದು ಆಪಾದನೆ ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಈ ಕ್ಷಣದಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲಾ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ತೀವ್ರತರವಾದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯಾಗಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಆಪಾದನೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊತ್ತಂತ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲಾ. ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾದುದಲ್ಲಾ. ಅವರು ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ ಸಿ ತೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ತಕ್ಷಣ ಆಕೆಯನ್ನು ಅಗ್ನಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಒಳಪಡಿಸಿ ಆಕೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಹೊರಬಂದಳೋ ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಇವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅಗ್ನಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ಎದುರಿಸಿ ಹೊರಗೆ ಬರಲಿ. ತಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ಈಗ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಬಂದಿರುವಾಗ ಇವರು ಮೊದಲು ಹೊರಬರಲಿ. ಇದನ್ನು ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವರು ಈ ಆಪಾದನೆಯಿಂದ ಮುಕ್ತರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ತೀರ್ಪು ಬಂದಾಗ ಮತ್ತೇ ಅವರು ಅದೇ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ. ಬೇಡ ಅನ್ನುವುದಿಲ್ಲಾ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಬಹಳ ತೀವ್ರತರವಾದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊರಾಲಿಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಲೀಗಾಲಿಟಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಇದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ವೆಂಕಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಜನತಾ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ತೀರ್ಪುಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆಯಲ್ಲಾ, ಮತ್ತೇನು ಬೇಕು ತಮಗೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದನ್ನೇ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತಾವು ಮೊರಾರ್ಜಿ ದೇಸಾಯಿ ಅವರ ಮಗನ ಪ್ರಕರಣದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ನಾಣಯ್ಯನವರು ಇದು ಒಂದು ಕಂಟಿನ್ಯೂಯಸ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೆಸ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದು ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷದಿಂದಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಸಹಿತ ಈವಾಗ ತಕ್ಷಣವಾಗಿ ಈ ಒಂದು ಸಿಚುಯೇಷನ್ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂತು ಎಂದರೆ ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಈ ಗ್ರೋವರ್ ಕಮೀಷನ್‌ನ ಒಂದು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಪೊತ್ತು ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ತೀವ್ರತರವಾಗಿ ಶುರುವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈವಾಗ ತಮಗೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಹೆಚ್ ಸಿ. ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯನವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರು ಸರ್ಟಿಫಿಕೇಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರನ್ನು ನಾವು ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ? ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೊಬ್ಬರು ಮೊರಾರ್ಜಿ ದೇಸಾಯಿಯವರ ಒಂದು ಇಷ್ಯೂ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನು ಆಪಾದನೆ ಇದೆ ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಮೊರಾರ್ಜಿ ದೇಸಾಯಿಯವರನ್ನೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಅವರು ಕರಪ್ಷನ್, ನೆಪೋಟಿಸಂ ಮತ್ತು ಫೇವರಿಸಮ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಜಡ್ಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಬಂದರೆ ಅವರನ್ನೂ ಬಿಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲಾ. ಅವರು ಆ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುತ್ತೇವೆ ಅಂದರೂ ಸಹ ನಾವು ಬಿಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲಾ. ನಾವು ಆ ಸ್ಥಾನದಿಂದ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಇಳಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಿಮಗೆ ಅಂಥಾ ಒಂದು ನೈತಿಕ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇದೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ೩ ಕೋಟಿ ಜನತೆಯ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತ ಯಂತ್ರ ಸುಸೂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾದ ಒಂದು ತೀವ್ರತರವಾದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸದನದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ಸುಸೂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮೊದಲ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಇರುವ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ಬದಿಗಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಡಿ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರ್ಣ ಸತ್ಯ ಹೊರಗೆ ಬರಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† SRI C. M. ARMUGHAM (K.G.F.).—Sir, this is a very important issue which has been raised on the floor of this House, and went on for more than two hours. It requires careful consideration of the Speaker and the House. I will confine myself whether the matter could be raised as an adjournment motion ; whether it is in order or not. I will not go into the details. As a longstanding Parliamentrian

the leader of the opposition knows what is an adjournment motion. The State legislatures and the Parliament are very careful and touchy about his adjournment motion. It is a kind of censure of the Government. Our leader of the opposition is very careful and intelligent in bringing this subject in the form of an adjournment motion under rule 50.

In this subject two points have arisen. I will confine myself to what the leader of the opposition said. The leader of the opposition tried to make out a case to allow a discussion on the Grover Commission report under rule 50 Secondly he said that the Chief Minister should resign or discontinue in office. So far as Grover Commission report is concerned, that report is not here with us. You may say that Press report is there, I don't have any dispute about the urgency and matter of recent occurence. All these things are stated in the rules of procedure. It is a procedure drafted long back which has to be re-drafted. I want to make this point clear. Can this matter be brought under an adjournment motion ? I submit that it can't be. Whatever is not mentioned in the Rules of Procedure, we can go back to the procedure adopted in the Mother of Parliament in U.K. It says that a matter for which the Government has no administrative responsibility may not be raised in this form. The Government of Karnataka has no administrative control over this Grover Commission and its functioning. Therefore, that subject cannot be brought for discussion under rule 50.

Somebody will ask—'Can we not raise discussion on this matter ? Certainly yes. It could be raised on a substantive motion on Grover Commission. But it cannot be brought under this provision. I could also say that this could be raised in the general discussisn. Nonetheless, it could be brought under a substantive motion. I agree that there are somany reports. Even there was a report on Mysore University which was discussed on the floor of the House. If the report is discussed what will happen ? Is that the intention with which you raise this matter ? Therefore, the leader of the oppsition could bring in a substantive motion for discussion on the Grover Commission. But it cannot be brought under an adjournment motion.

The other point is about the Chief Minister. Whether he should continue or step down. It is a matter which could be debated on a substantive motion. This is what the mother of Parliament decides. If you want to bring a substantive motion, that motion would be like a non-confidence motion. Therefore, I submit that it is not possible to bring an adjournment motion to discuss this matter which demands the resignation of the Chief Minister. If you peep

into the report, you will know the details. But it has not reached the State Government. It may take sometime to reach the State and take action. So, we will have to wait for sometime. The Parliament may also take it up or after reaching to the State Government, the State Government may place it before the House for discussion. It may or may not.

[MR. CHAIRMAN SRI (H. T. KRISHNAPPA) IN THE CHAIR—.]

The motion shall not anticipate a matter which has been previously appointed for consideration. In determining whether a discussion is out of order, regard shall be had by the Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the Assembly within a reasonable time.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—The first point is relevant. The Leader of the Opposition will have to be given an opportunity to say what he wants to say. In the mean while, I would like you to make your speech as brief as possible.

4.30 P.M.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—If you want, I will go out. I have not taken much time. I am not going to disobey the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—I am sorry, you have not understand me properly.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—I have understood you. I know you enough. But I respect you. If you feel that I am unnecessarily wasting the time of the august House, I am prepared to go out. Don't pass remarks about my point. I know the point better than myself, My point is this. If the Speaker anticipates the possibility of the matter being brought before the Assembly, within a reasonable time, I am submitting it is left to the Chair's wisdom, knowledge and information. If you think this matter can be brought for discussion before the House, my only submission is that it cannot be brought under Rule 50. I am not opposed for a discussion of the Grover Commission report. But what will be the consequences of the discussion of the report, I will leave it to you. Government is not responsible for the Grover Commission report ; it cannot be brought under this. Thirdly, an adjournment motion cannot be brought to demand there signation of the Chief Minister when there is a substantive motion In spite of the fact that it had all the support of the opposition members, I am sorry it does not conform to the Rules of Procedure.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—Sir, I would endeavour to answer certain points raised by members on the other side. They appear to me to be relevant to the issue. They seem to be labouring under some misapprehension and made certain observations. The Hon. Minister SRINIVAS SAID the findings of the Commission have become stale. I would invite his kind attention to Section (3) sub-section 4 of the Commissions of Enquiry Act which says :

> "The appropriate government shall cause to be laid before the House of the people or as the case may be, the Legislative Assembly of the State, the report, if any, of the Commission on the enquiry made by the Commission under sub-section (1), together with a memorandum of the action taken thereon, within a period of six months of the submission of the report by the Commission to the appropriate government,"

It is only on the findings of the Commission that the government should act under sections. On the receipt of the final report of the Commission, government places it with its memorandum of action. Government of India have been pleased to accept the findings of the Commission and there after, they have decided to transmit the findings for follow-up action. That is the legal position and therefore, all the argument that it is stale and has become old, does not stand scrutiny for the moment. This applies to the argument of Mr. Nanaiah that there is no urgency. Under section 3(4) of the Commission of Enquiry ACT, all these submissions do not stand scrutiny for a moment. Then Mr. Srinivas persuaded himself to make a flight into the region of imagination and made certain flippant remarks on the conduct or attitude of the Prime Minister and other Ministers of the Central Government in the face of certain allegations made against them. There is a large volume of legal opinion as to how allegations were made since the days of Pandit Nehru by a large number of responsible persons against Ministers and other persons holding high office. These allegations were not immediately considered by the Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—What Mr. Srinivas said has no relevance so far as the motion before the house is concerned.

SRI A. LAKSHIMSAGAR.—Mr. Srinivas made the submission that people living in glass houses should not throw stones at other. It only means that allegations have been made against the Prime Minister and others including Mr. Charan Singh, the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister and in spite of such allegations it does not lie in

your mouth to make allegations only against the Hon. Chief Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—The hon. Members very well know the ingredients of the provisions. May Concentrate on those ingredients.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—I understand. The members have made certain points. It is my duty and also the duty of the hon. Leader of the Opposition to meet those points, in the light of the historical material that is available. Nobody need go into the region of conjecture. Several allegations were made over years. Pandit Nehru did not take action on those allegations.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—Please try to avoid controversial statements.

SRI A. LAKSAMI SAGAR —I am not making any factual statement which is in controversy. In controvertible historical materials are now available in records. These are the general remarks that I would like to make. Then, I would only draw the attention of the Chair to a classifical instance. In 1958, serious allegations were made against Sri Pratap Singh Kairon.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—We have to confine ourselves to Rule 50 onwards to convince the Speaker about the admissibility. I can understand if the Dy. Leader of the Opposition touch the points which are not touched by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to convince the Chair about the admissibility of the motion. May be in the debate, some remarks might have been made but that need not be.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Some speakers were permitted to make certain statements which were not relevant to the point at issue. They went on making lenghty statements. They have been permitted. Firstly, permitting the non-signatories to the adjournment motion to speak is not correct. You have been kind enough to permit the hon. Members of the other side also, we have no objection for that. Let them say. At the stage of admissibility, some of the signatories should have been allowed to advance their reasonings for convincing the Hon. Speaker but now, it has taken a form of debate and number of hon. Members were permitted and they have made lengthy speeches and statement. When they made those lengthy speeches and statements, they have to be met in the debate ; otherwise, if we are not permitted to meet those points, they will go unchallenged. Having permitted it and then now to say.

MR CHAIRMAN.—No permission was ever given by the Chair.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—It is on record. The Cheir must allow us also to meet those points.

(MR. SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR)

Mr. Speaker.—Please be brief.

Sri A. Lakshmi Sagar.—I was only giving a classifical instance as to how the power that be in the Central Government in 1950's. I am with great anguish and pain persuade myself to tell you that it is only some of our friends happened to speak on a matter like this. You took upon the responsibility of warning time and again-you must be brief. You must be to the point but similar advice is not given to the other side.

Mr. Speaker.—The hon. Member cannot charge like that. It is incorrect.

Sri A. Lakshmi Sagar.—I am not charging. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has also said it.

Mr. Speaker.—The Speaker has to regulate the time. The hon. Member cannot dictate to the Speaker.

Sri S. R. Bommai.—Time should be regulated but we are sorry because when the Hon. Minister Sri Srinivas spoke, the Chair never interrupted. What time he took ? I am very sorry sir...

Mr. Speaker.—Why should you feel sorry ?

Sri S. R. Bommai.—You cannot dictate us. The other side also.

Mr. Speaker.—There is no question of dictating. I have to regulate the time. I have got the right to regulate the time.

Sri S. R. Bommai.—I would like to make an appeal to the Chiar. You are not applying the same standard. That is our experience. We are very sorry for that. It is a fact. When an adjournment motion is given. only some signatories are allowed to speak but you have permitted a debate and number of other hon. Member have been allowed to speak. When they were saying many irrelevant things, you never objected to it and they have said it.

Mr. Speaker.—You have submitted about the admissibility of the motion and they have submitted for the non-admissibility of the motion. Finally, it is left to the Speaker to decide.

Sri S. R. Bommai.—I agree but you never restricted the time for them. That is our experience.

Mr. Speaker.—I have also not rastricted the time to him. I said only "Please be brief".

Sri A. Lakshmi sagar.—Whenever I have had occasion to make submissions before you, I have been always very brief, systematic and very circumscribed in my submissions but it is my duty to meet all the points which were made by the Member on the other side. You were not here when I made preliminary observations. I said I

shall endeavour to meet all the points raised by the Members on the other side of the House and there after I will come to my submission.

MR. SPEAKER.—It is better if you make out a case for the admissibility of the Motion.

SRI A. LAKSHMI SAGAR.—Certainly that I will do to the best of my ability.

The manner in which the allegations against Mr. Pratap Singh Kairon were considered by the then Government is a classifical instance. There are number of others but I would confine myself only to the allegations that were made in 1950.

SRI M. C. NANAIAH.—Also about Mr. Badal.

SRI A. LAKSHMI SAGAR.—It did not happen in the manner in which it happened in the case of Mr. Kairon. Kindly go through the book "Ministers Misconduct by Mr. A. G. Noorani". I am not coming in the way. We are saying it. We are proclaiming from the house tops from the Prime Minister down to the Ordinary man. You can demand an enquiry. I am with you. That is not the question.

The matter went on. It was enquired into. The provisions of the Commission of Enquiry Act were not pressed into service from 1958 to 1964. The matter was kept pending. Several Committees of Experts and others of the then Congress Party went into it. At one time, Mr. Sriman Narain was asked to go into it. He said, there appears to be nothing substantial ; Then, jurists have gone into it and they have also stated that there is nothing in these allegations but persons who were persistently making allegations persisted and ultimately, Pandit Jawaharlal Nahru was compelled to appoint a Commission and the Commission gave smashing findings and Mr. Pratap Singh Kairon was asked to resign before the report was published. He refused to resign but when the report was published, he resigned. Are you prepared to go by this precedent ? This is one aspect of the matter. Another was—What are the allegations now made against the Prime Minister and his Son ?

SRI B. SUBBAYYA SHETTY.—He is going to extreneous matter. It does not pertains to Rule No 50. He is not convincing the Chiar about its admissibility. He is going to extraneous matter and this matter should be rebutted.

SRI A. LAKSHMI SAGAR.—Now, what is the standard ? Immediately within a matter of weeks or months, the allegations having been made, the resolution having been adopted by the Rajya Sabha, the Government of India has chosen to request Mr. Justice Vaidyalingam to go into the matter for the purpose of finding out a *prima-facie*

which the previous Government did not do. Within a matter of months, they have taken action and the Prime Minister has said if the findings are that there is a prima-facie case, "I shall be the first maa to order an enquiry."

SRI B. V. KAKKILAYYA.—Inspite of the decision on the resolution moved in Rajya Sabha the Government entirely took a different decision, The Central Government did not respect that decision. So let us not confuse ourselves.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—It is not a confusion. My friend Sri Kakkilayya has not understood the point. No Member of Rajya Sabha or Lok Sabha and no responsible person in this country has ever been persuaded to make a written allegation in respect of these persons. Let them do so. We will lead a delegation under the Leadership of Sri Bommai and persuade Prime Minister to appoint a Commission of Inquiry. You do not have any allegations to make. I know that......

SRI B. V. KAKKILAYYA.—They have appointed a House Committee to go into the allegations made in the Lok Sabha......

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—That is a different matter. Now, we are concerned with this case.

SRI K.H. RANGANATH.—Sir, Sri Charan Singh has mentioned about Sri Kanthi Desai's affair. Whatelse the hon. Member wants?. Sri Charan Singh has made a statement on the floor of the House about Sri Kanthi Desai......

SRI S. R. BOMMAI :—Sir, the Deputy Prime Minister Sri Charan Singh, who was the then Home Minister made a statement on the basis of the allegations made in a press. I want to make it very clear that no Member of Lok Sabha or Rajya Sabha gave individual complaint against Sri Kanthi Desai. I am not briefing for anybody.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ್.—ಅವರೇ ೬೭ ಚಾರ್ಜ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ವಕೀಲಿ ಅವರೇ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಪ್ರೂವ್ ಆಗಿರುವುದಷ್ಟು, ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ, ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ನಾನು ನೋಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ವಾದ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ನಾಳೆ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಒಂದು ತಿಂಗಳಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ವಾದ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್ ಅವರು ನೇಮಿಸಿದಂಥ ಮೀರ್ ಇಕ್ಬಾಲ್ ಹುಸೇನ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ಏನು ೩೩ ಚಾರ್ಜ್‌ಸನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿದ್ದರು, ಆ ಚಾರ್ಜ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲೀ ೫ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದದು ಫೈಂಡಿಂಗ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದಾವೆ. You have appointed a parallel Commission to enquire into charges submitted by us inspite of a Commission appointed by the Government of India. You have spent crores of rupees and challenged the order of the Government of India. But you have not succeeded in your case.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—Sir, then what happened. Inspite of allegations made both on the floor of this House and outside, inspite of written memorandum submitted by some of the then Ministers of the previous Government, Sri Devaraj Urs did not accept them though it was a fit matter for the appointment of Enquiry Commission. Sri Devaraj Urs postponed this matter for nearly 3 to 4 years. There are some Members who have made allegations are now sitting on that side.

Then Sir, in 1977 when Janata Party came into to power Sri Devaraj Urs took pre-emptive action in the appointment of Justice Mir Iqbal Hussain Commission.

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—Sir, please allow us some time so that we can reply to the charges made by the Opposition Members.

MR. SPEAKER.—Please come to the point.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR:—Sir, it is very relevant. The appointment of Justice Mir Iqbal Hussain's Commission was struck down by the Karnataka High Court as it was found unconstitutional. I would say in all humility the action by the Chief Minister in the appointment of Mir Iqbal Commission is the ugliest, and unashmable action to evade the corruption charges, But the same attitude has not been taken by the Prime Minister or the ministers of the Central Government when allegations are made in writing. I take the responsibility of convincing the Prime Minister if you make written allegation. There is no point in laughing This is a very serious matter. You are not capable to do that.

SRI B. SUBBAYYA SHETTY.—Are we to weep?

SRI A LAKSHMISAGAR.—Sir, another allegation was made by Sri K. H. Srinivas. He stated that the appointment of Grover Commission was a political appointment. Further he has said it was done for a political favourtism This was also the argument advanced by the learned Counsel for Karnataka before the Supreme Court when they have challenged the legality of the appointment of Grover Commission. But that point was not pressed by your lawyer. Therefore, now you cannot raise that point,

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—Sir, he is arguing the case. This is not a Small Cause Court......

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—I have not yielded......

SRI K.H. RANGANATH.—I raise a point of order. Sri K. H. Srinivas, while speaking has only stated that this motion cannot be admitted. That was his point. So, I am within my rights. That is why I said this is not a Small Cause Court......This is an Assembly......

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—Sir, hon. Minister for Parlimentary Affairs was pleased to state that this is not a Small Cause Court. I know that. We cannot argue this matter before the village Panchavat. If this is not forum then where we have to raise this issue. Can we raise this issue before the Small Cause Court. I have also argued before the Small Cause Court. I have also attended the High Court.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—I have also seen the High Court......

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—Sir, my only submission is this is the proper forum open to us to raise this matter. Then, Sir, the allegations made by them do not have any basis......

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—Sir. I raise a point of order. This is a motion brought under rule 50. Now, the Members can only canvass for the admissibility of this motion. They cannot go into the merits of the subjects matter. If they do so then would not be in order. I want a ruling from the Chair whether they can go into the merits of the subject matter.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ನಾನು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್ ಅವರು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮೊರಾರ್ಜಿ ದೇಸಾಯಿಯವರಿಂದ ಹಿಡಿದು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಜಾರ್ಜ್ ಫರ್ನಾಂಡಿಸ್‌ರವರಿಗೆ ಹಾರಾಟ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರು ನಿದ್ದೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ? ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು, ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೆಲ್ಲಾ ರೂಲ್ ೫೦ರ ಒಳಗೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ್. ನಾನು ಜಾಗರೂಕನಾಗೇ ಇದ್ದೆ. ಯಾರೂ ನಿದ್ದೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಲಿಮಿಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಲಿಮಿಟ್ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೋದರೆ ಏನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೆಲ್ಲಾ ಲಿಮಿಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇತ್ತೆ?

5-00 P. M.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—Rule 50 is clear. We will have to convince you about admissibility. We are not supposed to go beyond it. Is it proper for any member of this House to go beyond the rules while convincing the Chair about admissibility.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಅತ್ತಕಡೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇತ್ತಕಡೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು, ನಮ್ಮ ನಾಯಕರು ಹಾಗೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಉಪ ನಾಯಕರು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂತಹ ಅಗತ್ಯ ಇರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅತ್ತಕಡೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ರೂಲ್ ೫೦ರ ಒಳಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡದೆ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳದಿದ್ದರೆ ಪರಿಣಾಮ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅತ್ತಕಡೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮುರಾರ್ಜಿ ದೇಸಾಯಿರವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಚಾರ್ಜಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂತಹ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಕಾರಣ he is the Deputy Leader o the H use,

MR. SPEAKER.—He should confine himself to the rules and I can not permit him to reply to the points raised by other hon. Members.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—The second point made by the hon. Member Sri Arumugham is that when there is no scope for administrative res-

ponsibility of the State Government as a result of the findings of the Grover Commission, this cannot become the subject matter of an adjournment motion. May I submit that the Government of India. after having placed the findings of the Commission on the table of the House have indicated that they would be sending these findings to the State Government for follow up action. Therefore, there is administrative responsibility on the part of the State Government. Therefore it is very much within the scope of this rule.

SRI K. H. SRINIVAS.—Knowing fully well that the responsibility is on the State Government, how can the Government of India forward it to the same Government? If in their judgement it is not proper for this Government to deal with the report, how have the Government of India taken the decision to send that report?

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—That is the practice that the Government has followed in respect of commissions' reports. If my friend the Hon. Minister thinks that there is no need and that it is not necessary to send the report to the State Government because they do not have confidence is the State Government I am only sorry for that. That would be the next step. Therefore; to say that the State Government has no administrative responsibility does not hold water.

Then Sri Arumugham said......

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Sir, is it permissible for any member to reply to the points raised by other members? We are trying to follow certain peculiar procedure. That is only the prerogative of a Minister He takes down the points made by members in the course of discussion and replies to them.

MR. SPEAKER.—A member cannot go into the merits of the case while arguing for admissiblity or otherwise of a motion; he is also not entitled to reply to the points made by other hon. Members.

SRI C, M. ARUMUGHAM.—If he does that. I may also be allowed to reply to whatever he says.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಒಂದು ಸಲ ಅಲ್ಲ ಎರಡು ಸಲ ಶಾಸಕರಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದುಕೊಂಡು ಒಬ್ಬ ಸೀನಿಯರ್ ಮೆಂಬರ್ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ತಾವು ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯೇ? ದಯಮಾಡಿ ಹೇಳಿ,

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಅವರು ಸೀನಿಯರ್ ಮೆಂಬರ್. ನಾನು ಹುಡುಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ನನಗಿಂತ ನಾಲ್ಕರಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ವಯಸ್ಸಾಗಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿಸಾಗರ್‌ರವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ಇವರು ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಎದ್ದುನಿಂತು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರಲ್ಲಾ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಿ? ಅವರು ಒಂದೊಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಸೂಪರ್ ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ ಹಾಗೆ ವರ್ತನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—He is behaving like a super member in this House. He is also a member like me. When a procedure is not being followed correctly, it is my duty to point it out to the Speaker.

†SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.— One sentence is quoted from the book by Kaul and Shakdar in support of his point that it is not a definite matter. But that sentence pertains to some other matter. It says "an adjournment motion which seeks to raise a general discussion on political situation". We are not seeking to raise a general discssion on political situation. Then about the urgency. I will read: "matters arising during the period when the House is not in session should be raised on the first day the House meets". Yesterday we came to know of it and today at 11 O'Clock we gave the notice. This is a matter of urgent nature. Lastly "a matter to be brought under rule 50 must be a definite matter of urgent public importance". This is a definite matter referring to a particular individual. This is the first case where the very administration presided over by sri Devaraj Urs, the Hon. chief Minister is in jeopardy according to our submissions in view of the findings of the commission and therefore it is urgent and something has to be done in this behalf. For taking follow up action the findings are transmitted He is expected to take further action on the findings of the Commission. Now, Sir, there are one or two matters about which the Hon. Chief Minister made a promise that he would get them enquired into. One allegation related to the Hon. Minister Sri Srikantaiah. Last year on the floor of the House he said that he will get it examined. One year has passed. He is the Chief Minister and also the Home Minister. The follow up action envisages that if the findings reveal that a criminal act has been committed by any person he must take follow up action of investigation and the matter has to go before the police and then to court. He is in the position of a person against whom findings are given. He has to now go into this matter as a judge in a sense and the police department is working under him In a situation like this you cannot expect the Hon. Chief Minister Sri D. Deva raj Urs to sign his own political death warrant. Therefore, my submission to you is that we cannot think of a better motion than under rule 53 that we have given. If for some reason or the other you do not find it possible under the rules to agree for this, this will be a sad day for our State. Therefore, in all humility and in all serioueness that I can muster I submit to you to kindly accede to our request and allow a discussion a fuller and meaningful discussion on the matter in question.

MR. SPEAKER.—Now I call upon the Chief Minister to speak.

†SRI D. DEVARAJ URS (Chief Minister).—Sir, since 2 O' clock to 5.15 p.m. so much of wrangling has taken place in this House on the simple question of admissibility or otherwise of the adjournment motion brought. Now the time is already spent and so even if I

feel that this time need not have been spent like this, there is no use. What is spilt is spilt. As was pointed out by many speakers and most effectively by Sri C. M. Arumugham the hon. member from K.G.F the question before us is purely one of admissbility of the motion that has been sent. The other points which have arisen during the course of the submission, each person saying that they are reply to other points raised and all that, are not relevant to the question on hand.

In the first instance the report has to come before the State Government. Perhaps it is on the way. Now, even before the report comes before us and even before the Government goes into this, the Opposition Leader and other friends of his have brought this adjournment motion. Of course he will also agree that everyone of us are bound by the Rules of Procedure and if this motion is out of the bounds of the Rules of Procedure it cannot be admitted. For an adjournment motion to be admitted three ingredents are important They are : (a) it must be a definite matter of importance ; (b) it must be urgent and (c) it must of public importance. I do not want to go into other things. I will take only one aspect, definiteness. The business of this House do adjourn to discuss a definite matter of public importance, namely findings of the Grover Commission, finding Sri Devaraj Urs guilty of corruption, nepotism and abuse of power. I am sorry I have to repeat again because I think Sri Arumugham has stolen a march by quoting from the book by Shakdar ahd Kaul "An enquiry report is not a subject matter for adjournment." This is an enquiry report. It is stated that it should raise a "single specific". matter Here there is not one single specific matter. On this very point the whole thing false. I need not go into the other two points namely, whether it is urgent- may be urgent according to them and may be of public importance according to them. I am not going into all that. Only one point is enough for me to demolish whatever they have stated in favour of admission of this motion, viz., to say that this is an Enquiry Report which cannot be a subject matter for an Adjournment Motion because it cannot be a single definite matter. Even if it comes here tomorrow or the day-after or sometime later, an Adjournment Motion on this cannot be brought. They may cull out some points and bring some other motion—that is different. What they are asking now is an Adjournment Motion to discuss the whole report. Unfortunately, the report is not before us at all. What is it they want to discuss ? They want to discuss what has appeared in the Press perhaps. If they want to discuss what has appeared in the Press then what should happen to what has been stated in the report? The Press possibly cannot give everything that has been reported.

It can only cull out certain things and give. What more things are said in the report we do not know nor do they know unless they have seen in some other form or unless they had opportunities to look into it—I presume not. Therefore, even if they, I am wondering as to why they have brought this Adjournment Motion as if they are in possession of this report, as if they are in the know of whole thing.

Secondly Sir while writing this Motion they have stated three things : corruption, nepotism and abuse of authority or power. Perhaps it has been the practice with the Opposition Leader and his friends that whenever they want to attack the Government they take this word 'corruption' without understanding the meaning or the import of that word Even Mr. Grover himself has not been able to report any charge of corruption against me. I want my hon. friends to please understand and realise that. In their hurry and anxiety they have mentioned that word 'corrupt on' because when they made charges they did mention charges of corruption and nepotism and they have repeated the same thing. I do not know what all has been reported. Nowhere in the Press do I find any charge of corruption. There are other charges of nepotismof favouritism of mis-application of power. These are the things that have been charged, but not of corruption. I want the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to kindly understand this I wish he had known or gone through it before he tabled this motion.

Sir, although I do not want to elaborate on this point—I think I have made my point—because certain things have been stated by the Opposition Leader, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and some other friends, I wish to say in brief What I would like to say about what has been stated by them. The Grover Commission was appointed more than about two years back, and almost all the sittings were held in Bangalore. I do not have the Report—I have not seen it-somewhere it is stated that the Government has given all the facilities that Commisssion required. At least on that point there is no complaint. So much of publicity did take place. Every time the Commission went through the proceedings, the lawyers on both sides argued, and almost eveything used appear in the Press. It went on for nearly one year in such a way as to see that the persons involved or the Government or the Chief Minister was made to appear before the public eye as a person who is downright corrupt man who has done everything develish which was the very personification of evil in the State. In that way the propaganda was carried on This was carried on nearly for a year well befo e 1978 Elections and just before the Elections an Interim Report was also brought and that was also given

big publicity. With all these efforts the people of Karnataka knew what, was what where did lie the truth of the matter, who was doing what and with what motives and what reasons, and hence they knew how to judge As some friends pointed out, this subsequent report, which has appeared as final, in my humble view is not more damaging thanthe first Raport. Whether there were four charges whether there are seven charges here, those four charges which were so much publicised which came through the Interim Report were very severe and damaging comparatively, and all that was known to the public ; and all these friends including Leaders coming from Delhi never forgot in any public meeting to mention these charges. But, unfortunatley foe them they could not carry the conviction to the people. The people knew that what they were saying was far from truth—I do not want to say 'lie' because it is not parliamentary language and I do not want to use it—what all they stated was far from truth, and the public knew what it was and why it was going on.

For the first time, the Central Government has made this effort to appoint a Commission under the Commissions of Enquiry Act. I must also tell them that this has happened for the first time. In these 28 or 30 years, no previous Government made this effort of appointing a Commission through the Central Government. Once there was an effort made during Pandit Nehru's time when Sri Sahey was the Chif Minister of Bihar. When it went before Panditji, he wanted to appoint a Commisson of Enquiry aganist the Chief Minister. Then the Chief Minister challenged it stating that the Central Government or the Prime Minister has no authority to do so, and the advice given by the Law Department was taken by Panditji because he was a gentleman and a democrat and he sent back it is only then, the then Governor Sri A Anathtshayanam Iyengar who took up this matter with the then Chief Minister, and ultimately time passed and nothing happened. But the point I wish to make is that the Central Government for the first time after the Janata Party came to power in 1977, have made this effort to appoint a Commission of Enquiry against a State Government and a Chief Minister and Ministers under this Act. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was gloating over the fact that we took it up to the Supreme Court and nothing happened and it upheld. Sir, there will come a time when this very Supreme Court may have to give a different version of this Commission of Enpuiry Act—though it may not come now, it may come some years later. However, the Supreme Court judgement is there, I have no comments to make on that. But, I am still of the opinion that the Central Government has no authority under this

Act to appoint a Commission of Enquiry against any State Government. Well I know the reply—the Supreme court may say : 'who is he to say that ? ' The Supreme Court may say anything, but I have my option to say, I have my opinion to say, and this is my right here to say that. This Commission of Enquiry Act came into existence not after independence, it was just prior to independence it was there and that was in toto again approved and no changes have been made therein. The very purpose of this Act was for something different. The opposition has starting saying as if it is a judgement simply because an erstwhile judge of the Supreme Court has given a report.

5-30 P.M.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—It is not a judgement, we agree, it is only a report.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I thank you very much. It is an enquiry made and the facts and figures are collected and they have given their findings. The findings are not judgements. As long as it is not a judgement, I am afraid, that unless the government goes deep into the matter—I do not want to say anything regarding the findings, because he has come to the conclusion after going through the facts which were placed before him. Based on the very facts the lawyers can argue a case either in favour of a client or against a client. The findings are there. We have to go deept into the matter and examine each one of these findings and then come to a decision. The Central Government, I must say with all fairness, atleast now they have sent this report to the State Government for follow up action. To that extent I must admit here that they have been fair minded. In this instance they have acted in a fair manner. They have sent the report to the State Government without meddling. They have placed this report before the Parliament as the Central Government had made this order of appointment. The Central Government has said that they have accepted the report and sent it for us for follow up action. When the Commission was appointed the Governor's rule was there in our State. They took the Governor' s consent and appointed the Commission. Out of 7 charges they selected three and among the four charges they selected one and sent it to CBI for investigation. Even though the powers that were conferred upon the Delhi Police stood withdrawn, even now the one charge that was against Dr. Nataraj, the second son-in-law of mine regading grant of 20 acres of land, is till being looked into by the CBI and it is still going on. I have myself said that this charge should not be withdrawn, let it be looked into by the CBI.

Therefore Sir, under the circumstances this admissibility question is a matter which is very simple and clear. There is no complication here. the motion as it stands pertains to the discussion of an enquiry report, cannot be admitted as an adjournment motion. With these few words, I appeal to the Speaker to see that the motion is not admitted. While I say this, it does not mean that the Opposition has no opportunity. When the report comes, it is upto the Opposition to bring in another motion, it is purely left to their choice. But according to the rules of Procedure, this cannot be a matter for adjournment motion.

Thank you Sir,

SRI. S. R. BOMMAI.—So far as the admissibility is concerned, I agree that the report connot be a matter of adjournment motion; but if you read our motion, we do not propose to discuss the entire report we would only restrict it to a particular finding which is against the Chief Minister. We are not asking for the discussion of the entire report but only on the finding against the Cheif Minister. Another point is, the report is not received. Our Chief Minister knows more details of the report than us. I am very sorry for the ignorance of our Chief Minister and the persons who briefed him that it is the first time that the Enquiry Committee is appointed. An Enquiry Commission was appointed by the Government of India in 1963 to investigate the actions of late Sri Kairon, the than Chief Minister of Punjab.

SRI. D. DEVARAJ URS.—Please also note that the Commission was appointed with the consent of the Chief Minister. The then Prime Minister Sri. Jawaharlal Nehru took the consent of the Chief Minister and then appointed the Commission. It was in accordance with the wishes of the Chief Minister the Prime Minister took upon the responsibility of appointing the Das Commission. That also please note.

SRI. S. R. BOMMAI.—The Central Government appointed several Commissions. The Government of India adopted two methods in appointing Commissions. One way is that of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru method and the other way is that of his daughter Indira Gandhi's method. We know how Mrs. Indhira Gandhi appointed a Commission by dismissing Karunanidhi's Government in Tamilnadu when he was enjoying full majority and the Janata Government also should have done it. They could have appointed Commission dismissing the Ministry. But they appointed this Commission allowing the Ministry to continue in office. So for as Kairon is concerned there was no question of consent. His consent was not

taken by the then Prime Minister Mr. Nehru. Mr. Kairon not only opposed that Commission but also not given his consent. Without his consent, it gave a report. Before the report was published, he was asked to resign. But he refused to resign. Then, immediately after the publication of the report Mr. Kairon resigned. I want to know from the Chief Minister whether he would like to follow the example of Mr. Kairon?

Another point is about the relevancy to the publicity in the press. Publicity was given for the cross-examination made by the Advocates of Memorialists and also that of Chief Minister. I must congratulated those battery of lawyers who have been appointed by the Chief Minister.

Then he referred to 1978 election. I am sure that the people of Karnataka have voted for Congress (I) But still, I have got a doubt whether this vote was for Indira Gandhi or Mr. Devaraj Urs. Without Indira Gandhi he might not have come to power.

SRI. D. DEVARAJ URS.—All right, we got votes because of Indira Gandhi. I accept it. But how does Mr. Bommai's party people say something at one time and something else at another time? Not less than a person like Mr J. B. Kripalani your own leader–once said that even if a girl had been made to contest in that election, she would have won because of Mr. Devaraj Urs. Perhaps you must have forgotten it. So, whether you are correct or he is correct?

SRI. S. R. BOMMAI.—So far as Chickmagalur election is concerned what the Chief Minister says is correct.

SRI. S. M. YAHYA.—Mr. Bommai is appreciating both the leaders Mrs. Indira Gandhi as well as Mr. Urs.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ವಿಷಯ ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇಂದಿರಾ ಗಾಂಧಿಯವರ ಪಾಪ್ಯುಲಾರಿಟಿಯಿಂದ ಗೆದ್ದರಿ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಬಹುಶ: ಇಂದಿರಾಗಾಂಧಿಯವರ ವಿಷಯ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ದೇವರಾಜಅರಸ್ ಅವರಿಂದ ಗೆದ್ದರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಂತ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತಿಕೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತೆ.

SRI. B. N. KENGE GOWDA —Mr. Bommai used the words "guilty Devaraj Urs". It should be expunged.

SRI. S. R. BOMMAI.—I have not used such words. If I have used by mistake, it could be expunged.

Lastly, I would say that the Judgement of the Supreme Court is there. There is possibility of changing the views by the Supreme Court-I don't deny it. There is legal opinion and the Government

has power to appoint the Commission; so it has appointed it, Ultimately, I request that since this is most urgent and definite matter of public importance there cannot be any other matter which is more suitable for adjournment motion than this. Therefore, I humbly request that this may be permitted and discussion allowed.

MR. SPEAKAR.—Sriyuths S. R. Bommai and 10 other members of Legislative Assembly have given notice of an Adjournment Motion seeking a discussion on the findings of the Grover Commission. The Report of the Grover's Commission has been laid on the table of the Lok Sabha. Certain conclusions of Justice Grover indicating the Chief Minister and certain other Ministers have been reported in the papers. The Newspapers also report that the Report of the Commission of Enquiry has not yet been received by the State Government to take appropriate follow up action.

Whether the Report of a Commission of Enquiry could be a subject of an adjournment motion is for consideration. The Report of a Commission of enquiry is not a judicial pronouncement. As is well understood an adjournment motion is a parliamentary device to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. The matter to be urgent has been interpretted to mean that it should have arisen suddenly in the nature of an emergency. It is also understood that an adjournment motion, to be admissible, should relate to a subject matter which should be discussed immediately. In other words, it should be such a matter that it cannot brook any delay. If any other 'Parliamentary opportunity is available for discussing it within a reasonal time an adjournment motion is not admitted.

Judging the present notice on the criteria mentioned above it may be seen that the Demands for Grants relating to Chief Minister are coming up for discussion after in this month. Demands for Grants relating to other Ministers are now being discussed. Members could raise the matter when the Demands of the Chief Minister are brought before the House. The matter is not of such an urgent character as to leave off other business and discuss it to-day alone. One more criterian is, to be admissible as an adjournment motion, the matter must be such that there is some failure on the part of the Government and that failure should be brought to the notice of the House and the Government, so that Government would take immediate necessary action to retrive the situation. In this case it may be seen that there is no failure on the part of the Government. The Report as is reported is yet to be received by the Government and follow up action initiated by the Government. It is premature to imagine that there is any failure on the part of the Government.

Further the report deals with the findings with charges of favouritism, nepotism and abuse of power etc., This cannot be a definite matter to come within the ambit of adjournment motion. I am not concerned with issues regarding propriety and political morality. Considering all the points mentioned above. I withhold my consent to the adjournment motion.

SRI. D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, I would submit, if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition agrees, the House may meet in the morning, to-morrow. There is no time to discuss with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition because he was engaged completely here.

SRI. S. R. BOMMAI.—We can meet. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೆ, ತಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಇಂತಹ ಮಹತ್ವ ವಿಚಾರದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡದೇ ಇದ್ದುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತಿಭಟನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತಮಗೆ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ವಾಕ್‌ಔಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ.

(The Opposition members except Sri. C. M. Arumuyham and Sri. B. V. Kakkilaya staged a walk out)

SRI. D. DEVARAJ URS. –Morning session may be held tomorrow, Sir, that is my request. We may sit from 9A.M. to 1P.M. I don't know if the question hour can be there.

MR. SPEAKER.—The House now stands adjoured to meet at 9A.M. to-morrow.

The House adjourned at Fifty Five Minutes past Five of the Clock to meet again at Nine of the Clock on Friday the 11th May, 1979.